National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

IMPERIAL BOYHOOD: REPRESENTATIONS OF EMPIRE AND ADOLESCENCE IN RUDYARD KIPLING'S FICTION

BY

DONALD B. RANDALL

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**.

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Edmonton, Alberta
FALL, 1995

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA TO REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED PERSONS.

L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA DE REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES PERSONNE INTERESSEES.

THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER PERMISSION.

L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON AUTORISATION.

ISBN 0-612-06270-8

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

LIBRARY RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Donald B. Randall

TITLE OF THESIS: Imperial Boyhood: Representations of Empire and Adolescence in Rudyard Kipling's Fiction

DEGREE: Doctor of Philosophy

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1995

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Don Randall

Donald B. Randall

31-8406-104 street
Edmonton AB
T6E 4G2

October 2, 1995

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled **"Imperial Boyhood: Representations of Empire and Adolescence in Rudyard Kipling's Fiction"** submitted by **Donald B. Randall** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy**.

.....
Stephen Slemon

.....
Jo-Ann Wallace

.....
Juliet McMaster

.....
Susan Hamilton

.....
David Cooper

.....
Patrick Brantlinger

September 22, 1995

ABSTRACT

"Imperial Boyhood: Representations of Empire and Adolescence in Rudyard Kipling's Fiction" proposes the "empire boy" as a site of inquiry for a decolonizing cultural critique. Outlining first the socio-cultural history of boyhood's representation, the text then offers extended readings of The Jungle Books, Stalky & Co. and Kim. The analysis reveals that the "empire boy," the organizing figure Kipling employs to articulate his envisioning of the British imperial project, serves yet disrupts, asserts yet subverts, imperial authority and ideology.

Chapter one establishes the genealogy of the "boy," retracing the socio-cultural, historical process that constitutes and invests the figure, examining the articulation of childhood and the production of a privileged boyhood within the social text of imperial Europe. Chapter two focuses on the Mowgli saga of Kipling's Jungle Books, examining the liminal wolf-boy as the organizing figure in an allegorization of empire. Mowgli's jungle Bildung is shown to restage, allegorically, the history of the British in India. Organizing itself, most saliently, upon various allusions to the scenes and situations of the 1857 Indian Mutiny, the Mowgli saga works, not altogether successfully, to resolve imperial anxieties investing that historical event. Chapter three, on Stalky & Co., examines the "empire boy" in the context of the English school, revealing how Kipling disrupts the conception of an insular metropolitan culture, by opening this "centre" to the influences and inscriptions of the imperial "periphery." Kipling's schoolboy manifests an irresolvably ambivalent subjectivity; he is, ultimately, an imperial hero who bears an unsettling resemblance to the colonial subjects he dominates. Chapter four examines the hybrid Kim as an imperial agent. The first part of the argument employs Foucauldian theory to apprehend Kim's place and role within the disciplinary order of empire represented by the "Great Game." Noting preliminarily the unpredictable, potentially destabilizing effects of Kim's

multivalent "ethnicity," the argument proceeds with an analysis of the ethnographic implications of Kipling's text, an analysis that reveals the hybridized boy to be the ambivalent agent and the intractable object of imperial power-knowledge.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My doctoral research has received generous, ample financial support. I would like to thank the University of Alberta for the University of Alberta PhD Scholarship, the Walter H. Johns Graduate Fellowship, and, most recently, the University of Alberta Dissertation Fellowship. I am also very grateful for major-award funding provided by the Doctoral Fellowship of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and by the Alberta Heritage Fund's Ralph Steinhauer Award of Distinction.

As regards the work process of thesis production, I thank, first, my supervisors, Jo-Ann Wallace and Stephen Slemon, for the combination of rigorous criticism and collegial support they brought to my scholarship at all stages of its development. I thank Juliet McMaster for her acute, attentive reading of my document's advanced draft. The members of my examining committee, Susan Hamilton, David Cooper, and Patrick Brantlinger (in addition to those already named) deserve thanks for their challenging, energizing responses to my work. I am particularly grateful to Patrick Brantlinger for his acceptance of the role of external examiner and for his astute and appreciative criticism of the dissertation. I thank, finally, my fellow graduate students in English, who contributed a great deal to my scholarly formation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

1. Discovering and Theorizing the Genealogy of the "Boy" 22

2. The Jungle Books:
   Deployments of the "Boy" in Post-Mutiny Allegories of Empire 81

3. Stalky & Co.:
   Dislocating and Relocating the Empire and the "Empire Boy" 122

4. Kim:
   Disciplinarization, Hybridization, and the Liminal "Boy" 153

Conclusion 225

Works Cited 245

Introduction

East is East, and West is West . . .
Rudyard Kipling

In "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Gayatri Spivak opens her argument by interrogating the constitution of "Europe" as the "Subject" of modern international and intercultural relations. "Europe" or "the West," she finds, emerges within the space of its own cultural and intellectual production as the unique, self-constituted and self-sustaining Subject of the modern geopolitic.[1] Rather than being one of many elements formed within a complex interaction of nations and cultures, "Europe" (ostensibly) is in and of itself the agent of global history, the source of international initiatives. For Spivak, this world-ordering "Subject of Europe" represents a crucial (if all too often ignored or dissimulated) aspect of modern colonialism's legacy. Its constitution evidences an on-going "epistemic violence," a violent reordering and restructuring that operates at the level of the foundational categories of knowledge and knowledge production.[2] "The clearest example," she writes, "of such epistemic violence is the remotely orchestrated,

---

[1]Spivak's use of the category of the subject and, more particularly of the Subject (with an upper-case "S") reveals an indebtedness to Althusserian theory of ideology as it is elaborated in "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." Having first established the subject as the sine qua non of all ideological functioning, Althusser goes on to argue that ideology posits "a Unique, Absolute . . . Subject," by which it is "centered" and stabilized (178). The individual subject is only "a subject through the Subject and subjected to the Subject" (179). The Subject is thus the condition of individual subjectivities. Spivak's coding of this Subject as "Western" or "European" suggests that, within the contemporary structuring of global relations, all subjects are predicated in relation to a Eurocentric paradigm.

[2]The concept of the "episteme" is introduced and developed in Michel Foucault's The Order of Things. It is the site of the fundamental socio-cultural categories that order and delimit what can be apprehended, known, enunciated within a given social order at a particular historical juncture. "Epistemic violence" entails upheaval and radical reordering of the episteme.

far-flung, and heterogeneous project to constitute the colonial subject as Other. This project is also the asymmetrical obliteration of the trace of that Other in [Europe's] precarious Subject-ivity" (280-81). The "Subject of Europe" institutes, on the one hand, a levelling of cultural differences, their reduction to a singular difference in relation to the defining instance of "Europe"; despite their heterogeneity and diversity, all non-European cultural communities are subsumed as "the Other of Europe as Self" (281). "Europe," on the other hand, remains the self-same, unmarked by its Other. Although it shapes and informs its surrounding world, "Europe" is not reciprocally shaped and informed by that world. In this asymmetrical relation resides "the problem of the European Subject, which seeks to produce an Other that would consolidate an inside, its own subject status" (293), the problem of "a Subject that presides by disavowal" (292), by disavowal of the very Other in relation to which it is constituted and sustained.

Spivak, by offering this epistemic critique, moves beyond a limited understanding of modern imperialism as the manifestation of a unilateral, unidirectional project, as the process of European initiatives of violent intervention, domination, and exploitation—the process of "the West" acting upon "the Rest." Sustaining her analysis is the awareness that imperialism's history involves cultural confrontations which test and transform the nature of both the colonized and the colonizing cultures. "East" and "West" do meet, after all. The colonial "margin" impinges upon the imperial "metropolis." "Europe" is shaped in turn by the colonies it shapes. Indeed, it is precisely this fact of reciprocal transformation that is disavowed in the constitution of the sovereign "Subject of the West" and its colonial Other.

Spivak's critical and contestatory response to the epistemic paradigm she isolates takes shape as "a critique of European ethnocentrism" (293), which seeks to locate and deconstruct the Western episteme's instances of articulation. As Spivak makes clear, epistemic formations are enacted and inscribed as representational practices. The

episteme is only readable as representation. In the realm of representation, which is also the realm of discourse and ideology, it can be apprehended and critiqued. Spivak thus provides, in my view, a theoretical groundwork for new initiatives of decolonizing cultural critique, first focusing attention upon the epistemic binary opposition of self-sovereign, Western Subject and subordinate Other, subsequently emphasizing this paradigm's precarious, highly contingent formation in and by the modern European imperial project and, finally, locating in representation the site of the episteme's inscription.

In this thesis, I will strive to elucidate and interrogate aspects of what Jenny Sharpe, following Spivak, has called "a Western epistemology of the subject" (Allegories 15), by examining Rudyard Kipling's representations of imperial adolescence. I propose Kipling's adolescent protagonist, his "empire boy," as a literary figure whose fictional deployments articulate a Eurocentric and imperial world-view that conforms with Spivak's epistemic paradigm.[3] As I will also argue, however, this "boy" figures forth a site of contingency, a subject position in between opposed epistemic categories, in between the European, imperial Subject and its non-European, colonial Other. Kipling's "boy" is a mediating figure produced to stage the relationship between Subject and Other. Yet the figure intervenes in such a way as to unsettle, in the very moment of its articulation, this same binary opposition. Focusing

---

[3]Throughout this thesis I enclose boy and empire boy in quotation marks to signal and to recall their status as culturally invested figures whose resonance and significance extends beyond any particular instance of their representation. (I omit the quotation marks when using the phrase the figure of the boy and when discussing a specific boy-character.) In my first chapter, I offer a historical and genealogical examination of the "boy" as a site of cultural investment, as a paradigm for Kipling's youthful, imperial protagonists.

specifically upon The Jungle Books, Stalky & Co, and Kim,[4] my examination of the place and function of the "boy" in Kipling's fiction attempts to show how the figure confirms yet calls into question the epistemic formation Spivak describes.

The choice of Kipling as the focus of my critique is variously motivated. Considering the broadest issues first, I would say that Kipling commands attention as a representative voice—arguably, the representative voice—of a period E. J. Hobsbawm characterizes as the "Age of Empire," a period he considers as crucial not only to the structuring of the modern world but also to "the formation of modern thought" (4). During the period between 1875 and 1914, Hobsbawm observes, the imperial nations of "Europe"[5] translated their very real and long established "economic and military

---

[4]In all three cases I will be referring to recent publications of these texts in the "World Classics" series of the Oxford University Press, which include thorough "Notes" on each text's publication history and are edited with introductions by reputable scholars. The most obvious motivation of the choice is accessibility: given that there exists no clear pattern of consensus among Kipling scholars as to which editions to use, I have chosen texts that, without compromising the demands of serious scholarship, are readily available to any reader wishing to verify or follow up upon my work. More importantly, however, my choice reflects my intention to analyze the function of the Kipling "boy" in three key "scenes of writing." In two of my three cases, the instances of the pertinent "scene" are dispersed within quite complex publication histories. The Jungle tales and the Stalky stories were all extensively published within the periodical press before being collected in book form, as The Jungle Book (1894), The Second Jungle Book (1895), Stalky & Co (1899). "In the Rukh," which I consider crucial to the proper understanding of the Mowgli saga, appears in Many Inventions (1893) and is not included in either of the original Jungle Books. The short work entitled "Stalky," although it appeared in periodical form in 1898, is not included in the 1899 volume. It is only with The Complete Stalky & Co (1929) that "Stalky" finds its place—aptly, I think—as the first story of the Stalky series (which includes, at this point, four other compositions of more recent date).
The Oxford edition of The Jungle Books brings together the two original volumes and includes "In the Rukh" as an appendix. The Oxford Stalky and Co follows the text and arrangement of The Complete Stalky & Co of 1929.

[5]Hobsbawm's "Europe" is principally comprised of "northwestern and central" European nations such as Great Britain and France, but also includes, notably, the United States (17).

supremacy . . . into formal conquest, annexation and administration," partitioning virtually the entire non-European world "into territories under . . . formal rule or informal political domination" (57). With unprecedented clarity, the new global community thus constituted manifests itself, particularly for the triumphant, privileged European observer, not as "a single world" but as "two sectors combined together into one global system: the developed and the lagging, the dominant and the dependent, the rich and the poor" (16). Hobsbawm emphasizes the special importance of the 1890s—the decade of Kipling's spectacular "entrance" upon the British cultural scene—in the formation of the new world-view:

> [T]here is no doubt that the word "imperialism" first became part of the political and journalistic vocabulary during the 1890s in the course of arguments about colonial conquest. . . . The word . . . first entered politics in Britain in the 1870s, and was still regarded as a neologism at the end of that decade. It exploded into general use in the 1890s. By 1900, when the intellectuals began to write books about it, it was, to quote one of the first of them, the British Liberal J. A. Hobson, "on everybody's lips . . . and used to denote the most powerful movement in the current politics of the western world." In short, it was a novel term devised to describe a novel phenomenon. This evident fact is enough to dismiss one of the many schools in the tense and highly charged ideological debate about "imperialism," namely the one which argues that it was nothing new . . . . It was, at any rate, felt to be new and was discussed as a novelty. (60)

What most specifies the 1890s (and constitutes that decade's principal bequest to subsequent ones) is a generalized and intensified, emotionally and politically charged consciousness of a newly named "imperialism"—a consciousness Rudyard Kipling did much to forge, foster, and define.

"The number of people directly involved in empire was . . . relatively small," Hobsbawn observes, "but their symbolic significance was enormous." At the forefront of this select group Hobsbawm places "Rudyard Kipling, the bard of the Indian empire" (82). As the British public—in popular, political, intellectual, and cultural

circles—became more acutely and more generally aware of Britain's status as a pre-eminent imperial power, as the British Empire, already enormously and longstandingly a fact, came to be understood in emotive and evocative terms, Kipling's reputation and popularity grew accordingly. James Morris states the case succinctly: while the British nation "talked empire, thought empire, dreamed empire . . . Rudyard Kipling [was] translating the emotions into art" (Farewell 29). Part of my project, certainly, will be the attempt to apprehend Kipling as an imperial artist or, to use Benita Parry's formulation, "an exemplary artist of imperialism" ("Contents" 61). I will consider Kipling not as an accomplished literary artist who happened to have imperialist sympathies, nor as one whose work is marred by excursions into imperialist polemic, but as one whose work is informed at every level by an imperialist project. As Parry observes, Kipling is instrumental in the elaboration "of England's mysterious imperialist identity and destiny" and in "the projection of the white race as the natural rulers of a global space created and divided by imperialism" (61-62). In Kipling's work, empire becomes vividly, elaborately, intimately meaningful—a vast mirror in which metropolitan Britain, triumphantly and at times anxiously, learns to measure itself.

Notwithstanding Kipling's undeniable role as an imperial standard-bearer, the proper evaluation of his "representativeness" requires a sensitive appreciation of nuances. As Zohreh T. Sullivan asserts in her recent Narratives of Empire, this quintessential imperial author is also "the quintessentially divided imperial subject" (6), whose writing manifests "the competing forces of imperial representation and domination" (9) and "gives voice to the full fragmentation of the colonizer's many subject positions and ambivalences" (11). Kipling, in my view, is representative in the fullest sense: his work stages the professed hopes and disavowed fears, the obstreperous confidence and the more muted misgivings; it registers the various, often disparate and divided discourses of late nineteenth-century British imperialism.

The salient importance of Kipling's work is also signalled by the fact that it foregrounds one of the most enduring and important cultural confrontations in the history of the European empires, the confrontation between imperial Britain and India. In part through Kipling's mediation, the vicissitudes of British-Indian colonial confrontation are made to exemplify the generalized and irresolvable opposition of "East" and "West." At the same time, however, it is Kipling who provides the imaginative framework that confirms India as the core concern in the making and maintaining of Britain's status as an imperial power. As Edward Said acknowledges in Culture and Imperialism, Kipling's "importance in the definition, the imagination, the formulation of what India was to the British empire in its mature phase, just before the whole edifice began to split and crack, is undeniable" (133).

Kipling's understanding of Anglo-Indian relations, one must recall at the outset, was formed within a post-Mutiny context. The Indian Rebellion of 1857 is the signal event in what Eric Stokes calls an imperial "crisis of consolidation" (Peasant 1). It provoked what Jenny Sharpe describes as "a crisis of colonial authority" ("Unspeakable" 29), which provoked in turn a transformation of the attitudes and practices informing the British Raj. As Lewis Wurgaft characterizes the change, the British began to conceive of "the gap" standing between European and Subcontinental cultures

> in absolute moral and racial terms, rather than as an aspect of intellectual or cultural progress. . . . The meeting point between British and native culture had vanished. . . . [T]he Anglo-Indian community became increasingly defensive, and increasingly isolated from the realities of Indian social and political life. (10-11)

Post-Mutiny isolationism takes shape, ideologically, as a project of detached domination: power is exercised at a certain distance, in the absence of social engagement and involvement; knowledge of the colonized and their culture becomes

increasingly a matter of "scientific" accumulation and administrative application. Positing and promulgating a social, cultural, and psychic distance separating the Briton from the menacing, alien Indian, British power becomes more watchful and suspicious, more insular. Responding to the perceived threat of Indian resistance and rebellion, which the Mutiny inscribes indelibly upon the imperial consciousness, British colonial authority exaggerates its stance, which had always been tendentially Olympian and aloof. Summarizing the case, Edward Said writes, "the Mutiny [is] the great symbolic event by which the two sides, Indian and British, achieved their full and conscious opposition to each other. . . . The Mutiny, in short, reinforced the difference between the colonizer and the colonized" (Culture 147). What needs, however, to be stressed—at least in an evaluation of Kipling's understanding of British-Indian relations—is the defining impact of this "symbolic event" upon the British side: the Mutiny provided the organizing referent for a noteworthy change in the British disposition, a change that manifested itself, most notably, in the need to understand and represent British-Indian encounter in terms of opposition and difference.[6]

---

[6]Given that the Kipling fictions I consider stand at a distance of four decades from the events of 1857-58, my stressing of the determining significance of the Mutiny may seem somewhat strange. As my chapters on Kipling demonstrate, however, the Mutiny has a prominent place in Kipling's imaginative rendering of India and of British-Indian relations. His emphasis of the Mutiny's importance reflects, moreover, contemporary British attitudes. Noting "the assiduous cultivation of the mythology of the Mutiny" throughout the later nineteenth and early twentieth century, Eric Stokes affirms that the Mutiny initiates and sets its mark upon a "decisive historic phase" that endures until the advent of Gandhi (Peasant 1-2). For Karl de Schweinitz, the "Great Revolt" provokes "a break in the continuity of British governance in India" (175) whose radical effects can be traced through to the Amritsar massacre of 1919. Like Wurgaft, Schweinitz foregrounds the change in British attitudes and the inception of "more efficient, if more impersonal rule"(175): after the Mutiny, "British policy in India was designed less to fulfill the purposes of a trustee charged with the responsibility of guiding its ward to maturity than to increase the efficiency with which a foreign ruler governed a subject people" (174). Taking a different view, Francis Hutchins argues that the Mutiny "crystallized" incipient British perceptions of India, setting the tone and establishing the core notions of British thinking about India throughout "the latter half of the nineteenth

Representing this opposition and this difference in British terms is central to the British bid to reassert the authority the Mutiny had put into question: "In the post-Mutiny era, the British began to represent their sovereignty in a set of discursive practices that they reenacted for themselves as much as for their Indian subjects" (Sharpe, Allegories 4). Kipling's work responds to this drive to discursively reconfirm and reconsolidate British hegemonic claims, to represent and re-present—to speak for and to speak again—the meaning of the imperial mission in the face of contestation, to confirm "the illusion of permanence" in which Francis Hutchins locates the self-sustaining myth of the post-Mutiny Indian empire. Wurgaft rightly observes that "As a mythmaker for a culture under protracted stress, Rudyard Kipling help[s] to articulate . . . a symbolic code" in and by which an imperial project in crisis could rediscover and redefine the sense and justification of its endeavors. Thus, "The idea of 'Kipling's India' is at once a construct, and a compelling reality in the history of British imperialism" (Wurgaft xx). Yet, both as construct and in its historical materiality and agency, Kipling's representation of British India registers and is necessarily informed by the crisis and contradiction it seeks to resolve. His texts are fraught with internal tensions, vacillations, ambivalences, which signal their pertinence as sites for a postcolonial critique of imperial ideology and its discourse. As Parry remarks, "To a criticism concerned with mapping the exclusions and affirmations of an imperialist culture whose legacy has still not been spent, these same texts can be made to reveal

---

century" (x). Hutchins also observes, by way of contrast, that the later "nationalist movement, to an astonishing extent, drew no response from the British imagination in India. It is almost impossible to find references to nationalist politics in contemporary memoirs" (187). (As Said remarks, Kipling, in Kim, extensively invokes the Mutiny and makes no mention of the Indian nationalist movement.) Despite differences of project and perspective, Stokes, Schweinitz, and Hutchins concur in considering the Mutiny as the organizing referent of a transformation of British India that articulates itself before and during Kipling's time of writing.

both imperialism's grandiloquent self-presentation and those inadmissible desires, misgivings, and perceptions concealed in its discourses" ("Contents" 62).

To read the complex ambivalencies of Kipling's fictions as manifestations of an imperial "crisis of consolidation" is, however, to consider only half of his "story"—and perhaps not the most interesting half. Also at issue in the analysis of Kipling's work is an effect of cultural and subjective "hybridization," to employ Homi Bhabha's useful concept.[7] In the process of cultural confrontation, difference and opposition must be understood in cultural (as well as political) terms, not as static and absolute but rather as active, transformative agencies. As S. P. Mohanty emphasizes, two cultures engaged in prolonged and intense, agonistic interaction "can be seen as implicating and potentially redefining one another" ("Kipling's" 38). Reconsidered from this perspective, the conception of a "gap" between the two cultures, between the subjects of the two cultures, reveals itself as an anxious ideological reaction against the fact of mutual "implicatedness" and reciprocal redefinition. The "gap," in the various instances of its articulation, marks the place of a threshold under stress, a threshold that has become, or is becoming, uncertain.[8] In the confrontation of cultures, the quest to

---

[7]Bhabha's analysis of the ambivalences of colonial discourse and the consequent hybridity or liminality of colonial subjectivity begins with "Of Mimicry and Man" (1984) and is further developed in such texts as "Sly Civility" and "Signs Taken for Wonders" (1985). In "Signs" Bhabha writes, "If the effect of colonial power is seen to be the production of hybridization rather than the noisy command of colonialist authority or the silent repression of native traditions, then an important change of perspective occurs. It reveals the ambivalence at the source of traditional discourses of authority and enables a form of subversion, founded on that uncertainty, that turns the discursive conditions of dominance into the grounds of intervention" (154). Hybridity thus emerges for the postcolonial critic as "a problematic of colonial representation and individuation" (156).

[8]The "gap," for example, that is presumed to stand between British "civility" and Indian "barbarity" is most emphasized during a historical moment when the two terms are enacted as resemblance. As Sharpe notes in Allegories of Empire, the Mutiny drama is played out amidst the "retributions" of an outraged "civility," which mirror, and even surpass, the "savage excesses" they are intended to punish and correct.

find a "pure" site of subjectivity, a "pure" site for the articulation of difference, is deeply problematized, deeply compromised. The everpresent trace of the Other reveals itself as the very condition of subjectivity.[9] Kipling's work, quite spectacularly, manifests this problem of a subjectivity constituted upon the unassimilable yet indelible trace of its Other. Attempting to situate Kipling and his work within the context of post-Mutiny India is a complex but decidedly interesting undertaking, precisely because Kipling could never (try as he might) apprehend and articulate in absolute terms the difference and the opposition of which Said speaks. His perspective, certainly, is not "Indian," but nor can it be described as "metropolitan," nor even as "Anglo-Indian" in any pure and continuous sense.[10] Kipling represents a liminal subjectivity situated on the in-betweens of cultures and cultural identities involved in a process of mutual transformation. His work insistently thematizes the limen. If this work serves—as I

---

[9]I invoke, here, the core notion informing and organizing theories of the subject regardless of the particularities of their conception and orientation—psychoanalytic, ideological, or poststructuralist. To speak of a "subject" rather than a "self" is always to acknowledge that this "subject" is not autonomous, not self-sovereign, but rather deeply determined by external structures and forces—by that which is "other" than itself. The subject only exists in relation to its other. The dynamic tension sustaining the subject is to be located in the subject's drive to assert its autonomy in the face of the fact of its determination, its inscription, by the other. What I characterize here as the core notion of theories of the subject is, of course, clearly evident in Spivak's description of a "Subject of Europe" that constitutes itself as self-sovereign by disavowing its formation in relation to its Other.

[10]Of these three designations, "Anglo-Indian" (by which I mean the acclimatized English colonizer) is the most apt, if one takes seriously the cultural liminality it would seem to name. Yet Kipling, even during his early career in India, cannot be easily, seamlessly, identified with the views and attitudes of the late nineteenth-century "Anglo-Indian" community—given that the foibles, the prejudices, the ethnocentric alienation and eccentricity of Anglo-Indian society are often ridiculed, even burlesqued, in the early poems and stories, notably in Departmental Ditties and Plain Tales from the Hills.

think it certainly does—in the constitution of a "Subject of Europe" that is distinct from, set apart from its Other, yet it also manifests the impossibility of this paradigm.[11]

Kipling's "boy" is very much a creature of the limen, a figure set upon the thresholds that separate and distinguish opposing identities, spaces, worlds, the thresholds—all of them pertinent to the ideological mapping of empire—that exist (or are presumed to exist, made to exist) between animal and human, early childhood and full adulthood, between nature and culture, barbary and civilization, between white and dark, East and West, colonizer and colonized, and (in the ultimate and defining instance) the European Subject and its Other. It is the role of the "boy" to test, even to transgress, the borders and frontiers, not so as to destroy them, but rather the better to uphold them. Paraphrasing Baden-Powell, one could say that the Kipling "boy" serves to fortify the walls of empire. As the figure embodying a multivalent liminality, the "boy" is able to perform what Mary Poovey has called "the work" of ideology: situated in between various cultural worlds and identities, the "boy" acts as a "go-between," as a mediator negotiating and ultimately reinscribing the terms of ideologically pertinent distinctions.[12] In his function as mediator, the "boy" is most

---

[11]Taking note of biography might be worthwhile here. Kipling's birth (in 1865, less than a decade after the Mutiny), his nonage, his early manhood, and his precocious maturation as a writer all take place in India. The Kipling who writes The Jungle Books has spent half his life in India. The writer of Kim has spent more time there than in England, the United States, or South Africa. Kipling, who writes India, is also written, in part, by an intense and diversified experience of India. In so saying, I do not intend to suggest that Kipling enjoyed some sort of unmediated relation with a "real India," nor to reify his "experience" as a quantity that may be diametrically opposed to ideology, but rather to suggest that in experience ideology discovers at once its function and its dysfunction. Ideology informs experience but is never entirely commensurate with it. Inevitably, I think, there will occur, in the course of a prolonged engagement with a given social formation, experiential moments that manifest the inadequacy of an ideology's representation of real conditions and relations.

[12]Clearly, my discussion of liminality draws upon the anthropology of Victor Turner, as developed, most notably, in his Dramas, Fields, Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society. Turner finds the social function of liminal figures in their testing and

pertinently the bearer of a gaze, as my analysis will repeatedly demonstrate. By seeing and situating, by exercising a gaze that discovers and specifies identities and spheres, the "boy" acts as agent in the "envisioning" of imperial order. The "boy," characterized by access and mobility, brings an imperial "gaze of power" to a multiplicity of sites, offers to the imperial eye a multiplicity of perspectives. In this figure resides the potential for an all-embracing (that is, totalizing) vision that integrates and co-ordinates under a continuous imperium the various, dispersed sites where power intervenes. As gazer, the "boy" mimes a real practice of power—the practice of a surveillance that by seeing, knows and, by knowing, controls. And, at the same time, this gazer brings to an empire the assuring appearance of a spectacle, in which scenes, actions, relationships are infused with meaning and the appearance of formal necessity.

It is crucial, however, to note that the liminality of the Kipling "boy" is never envisioned as a passing phase in a more extensive history of development. The boy remains, throughout the duration of his textual existence, a boy; in keeping with the archetypal instance of J. M. Barrie's Peter Pan, the boy never "grows up," never achieves a stable placement within a distribution of identities.[13] If the identity and social "situatedness" of the "boy" are never resolved, it is, I would affirm, because they cannot—indeed, must not—be resolved. Kipling's enduringly liminal "boy" represents an overdetermined site of cultural production, where a multiplicity of

---

transgressing of social boundaries, which serves, ulitmately, to knit social structures together, to give to the totality of these structures a more organic coherence. Without overlooking this function, I want also to consider liminal figures as imperial agents who facilitate an ideological mapping of colonial societies.

[13]I understand "growing up" to entail, necessarily, a stabilizing and fixing of identity. Thus, Mowgli, the young man who enters into imperial service under Gisborne, is not entirely "grown up," in so far as he is still very much a liminal being, enduringly enjoying uncanny powers of woodcraft. Stalky, the young officer in India, is virtually indistinguishable (in his tactical "stalkiness" and in his perturbed relation with "higher authorities") from Stalky, the shifty, liminal schoolboy.

incommensurate meanings are maintained in complex, ultimately irresolvable interplay. Only in terms of this overdetermination does the figure discover its ideological function as an instrument of imperial power, yet this same overdetermination signals the possibility of a deconstructive critique. The "boy" is a shifting, uncertain, unstable figure, one that always has the potential to destabilize the systems and structures of power he inhabits. A subject under authority, the "boy" is at once an agent and an object of imperial power, a site where power is deployed but also a site of resistance. Shifting amongst various subject positions, he sees and experiences his world from various, often incommensurate perspectives. He represents an unstable site of imperial identification. His own identifications are divided, moreover, between or amongst the various communities—imperial and colonial—with which he is affiliated. One may thus discover in this figure of the boy a linchpin, constituting and assuring the strength of imperial order and organization, but signaling also, at the same time, its potential weakness, its vulnerability.

I consider Kipling's "empire boy" as the site of a complex staging of imperial subjectivity and agency, a staging that does not merely reflect British imperial ideology but intervenes both productively and disruptively in its enunciation. Clearly, then, my critical orientation does not conform to what one might call the "model theory" of imperial boyhood, according to which the boys represented in imperial fictions manifest certain characteristics—values, motivations, patterns of conduct—favorable to the imperial enterprise, characteristics that, in a spirit of emulation, are apprehended and adopted by the boy outside the text—the boy reader.[14] Without denying the value

---

[14]In his "Introduction" to Imperialism and Juvenile Literature, Jeffrey Richards presents a paradigmatic case for viewing empire boys as models. "Popular fiction," he begins, "is one of the ways by which society instructs its members in its prevailing ideas and mores, its dominant role models and legitimate aspirations" (1). "The aim of juvenile literature," Richards goes on to say, "was clearly stated . . . . It was both to

and pertinence of the "model theory," I want to venture beyond its bounds, initiating a critique that does not necessitate the invocation of a supposedly clear and delimited category of "boy's literature," a literature about boys that is, in some unspecified yet obvious way, for boys.[15] The "boy," in my view, is a complex, multifaceted signifying element that cannot be isolated or dissociated from the larger dynamic of imperialism's social text. Around the figure of the boy and in relation to him, a variety of subject formations are structured, specified, and distributed. The "boy," that is, participates in a textual economy that implicates a variety of potential subjects, a variety of possible reader-participants. To clarify by way of example, one may consider the Scout Movement. It is true that, in his inaugural Scouting for Boys, Baden-Powell proposes Kipling's boy characters as models for the scout. As the movement evolves, however, there ensues—I would say, necessarily, inevitably—a more extensive appropriation of the Kipling text: boy-scout assemblies become "packs"; younger initiates are admitted as "cubs"; the (adult) scout leader is named "Akela"; his (adult) assistants are named "Bagheera" or "Baloo." Part of the project of my study, then, is to show, on the one hand, that the "boy" is necessarily figured

---

entertain and to instruct, to inculcate approved value systems, to spread useful knowledge, to provide acceptable role models" (3).

[15]Without tackling the problems involved in any attempt to situate Kipling's work (which enjoyed a general readership) within a "boy's literature," I want to question the validity of such a category. As Jacqueline Rose has compellingly argued, "children's literature" (which would include "boy's literature") is a category or "genre" erected upon its own impossibility. In The Case of Peter Pan or The Impossibility of Children's Fiction, Rose emphasizes the transformative impact of modern psychoanalysis upon conceptions of the relation between adulthood and childhood. After Freud, she observes, "adult" and "child" can no longer be understood to name distinct, isolable moments in a human life. As Freud's work reveals, adult self-fashioning is deeply, ceaselessly involved with childhood experience; adulthood constitutes itself in dynamic relation with childhood. The impossibility of "children's literature" resides in the adult's inescapable incapacity to apprehend and to represent the child objectively, disinterestedly. Literature "for children" is always, necessarily, "for adults" as well.

within a specific symbolic order of distinctions and, on the other hand, that this figure has the power to reorganize and redistribute formations of the subject, to reconfigure symbolic order.

Clearly, by speaking of the "boy" (rather than, say, of the "child" or the "adolescent") I raise the question of gender—the very question Kipling's fictions of adolescence have always-already answered, unambiguously. Although my deconstructive critique is not focused upon the issue of gender, I am obliged to mark its pertinence to the constitution of the "boy." Kipling's representations of imperial boyhood participate in a generalized tendency to discursively segregate the feminine and set it apart from the making and the managing of empires. Here again, one can discern the separation of masculine and feminine spheres, which Mary Poovey has shown to be central to the ideological deployment of the category of gender in the nineteenth century. Empire building, in Kipling's fictions of the "boy," is not considered as a potential sphere for feminine action. Indeed, female figures, active or passive, are relatively rare. Edward Said's description of Kim as an "overwhelmingly male" text (Culture 136) may be extended without qualification to The Jungle Books and Stalky & Co. When female figures do appear, they intervene most typically as obstacle or cause in the enactment of masculine endeavor. The active agency of female characters—still more rare in its manifestations—invariably responds and conforms to masculine instigation or need. Its force is elided, its effects co-opted.[16]

---

[16]A couple of brief examples may be useful here. Mother Wolf adopts and nurses the needy man-cub, bravely defends him from the formidable Shere Khan, then discreetly retires from prominence as Mowgli (very promptly) becomes the protégé of Bagheera, the pupil of Baloo. The impressive and influential Woman of Shamlegh, having provided Kim with much needed supplies and bearers, receives in thanks an arrogant and aggressive kiss, which acknowledges and shames her desire for the attractive young spy. The kiss marks the woman as "impertinently" desirous, as yet another troublesome woman; the kiss, that is, recodes her as obstacle (rather than agent), as an unnecessary complication in the elaboration of masculine projects. Female agency is

The empire as it is represented in Kipling's fictions corresponds in its broad outlines to a commonplace image of empire: as Said duly notes, it is "a masculine world dominated by travel, trade, adventure, and intrigue" (Culture 137). Kipling's treatment of the "boy," as my first chapter will demonstrate, is founded upon discourses of the child, which "engender" the "boy" and assign him his special role in the projects of an expanding Europe. Yet general tendencies within modern imperialism's social text cannot, in and of themselves, account fully for the coding of action and agency in masculine terms within Kipling's fictions of the "boy." His representation of a "boy"-oriented, male-dominated imperial project constitutes what one might call a representative misrepresentation of late nineteenth-century imperial actuality, which is clearly, unignorably marked by women's interventions.

As Napur Chaudhuri and Margaret Strobel observe in their "Introduction" to Western Women and Imperialism,

> In general, theories about colonialism have stressed its "masculine" nature, highlighting the essential components of domination, control, and structures of unequal power. . . . For the most part, scholarship has reinforced the common belief among imperialists that colonies were "no place for white women." Consciously or unconsciously accepting the "masculine" attributes of colonialism, most scholars have simply excluded or marginalized Western women from the focus of their studies. . . . They have not analyzed the complexity of the roles played by Western women in colonial history. (3)

Chaudhuri and Strobel therefore assert the importance of new scholarship that reveals "the complex dynamic of complicity and resistance" characterizing Western women's intervention in imperial history (7). They recall the famous "lady travelers" Mary Kingsley and Mary Hall, whose writings "[mix] endorsements of empire with accounts of personal experience that undercut imperial notions of superiority" (6), together with

---

thus co-opted: Kim (ostensibly) acquires what he needs despite the impediment of the woman's desire.

the home-bound and decidedly less ambivalent Flora Shaw, who, "as the colonial editor of The Times of London during the 1890s . . . played a leading role in legitimizing the conquest and domination of other lands in the name of civilization and development" (7). Having earlier affirmed the special significance of British imperialism and, even more specifically, of British imperialism in India in the study of European imperial history (5), Chaudhuri and Strobel go on to stress the prominent role of British women activists in the articulation of opposition following upon the presentation of the Ilbert Bill, which proposed to empower Indian judges to try Europeans. (The Ilbert controversy informs and inflames much political debate upon Indian questions throughout the 1880s, the decade of Kipling's "seven years hard" as a journalist in India.) Also noted are women activists in India—Mary Carpenter, Annette Ackroyd Beveridge, Margaret Noble, Margaret Cousins, and Eleanor Rathbone—who strive to enact "a benevolent maternal imperialism" in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (8-9). During the same period, middle-class British feminist activists in Britain contemplate from afar the case of Indian women, whom they consider "as passive subjects and as examples against which to gauge their own progress." And women writers living in India, notably Flora Annie Steel and Annie Besant, make use of their experience to inform "analyses of race, class, and power" that both conform to and contest the dominant imperial ideology of their time (9). Chaudhuri and Strobel thus compellingly demonstrate British women's agency in shaping the imperial project, most notably in India, the principal sphere of Kipling's concern.

Chaudhuri and Strobel's contribution makes clear that both before and during the period of Kipling's writerly formation Western women's agency in the elaboration of imperial ideology and actuality is undeniable. Kipling's fictions of the "empire boy" thus constitute a masculinist intervention in a highly charged and immediately contemporary political arena. As Poovey has amply demonstrated in her Uneven Developments, gender was a crucial and contested area of concern in nineteenth-

century British culture. She emphasizes, however, that "[t]he system of ideas and institutions" arising around the question of gender and its representation was

> uneven both in the sense of being experienced differently by individuals who were positioned differently within the social formation (by sex, class, or race, for example) and in the sense of being articulated differently by the different institutions, discourses, and practices that it both constituted and was constituted by. (3)

By thus recalling that the formation of discourses, ideologies, social institutions and practices involves incommensurate experiences of the social which are differently articulated, Poovey attests to the view that "any image that is important to a culture constitutes an arena of ideological construction rather than simple consolidation" (9). The "empire boy" may supply, here, a key example. By articulating some of his most noteworthy contributions to imperial culture and ideology in relation to a "boy" at work and at play in male-dominated imperial settings, Kipling is reinforcing as much as reflecting a masculinist bias in the envisioning of imperialism's structure, character, and mission. Kipling's "boy" asserts, against palpable socio-cultural opposition, the "maleness" of imperial endeavor. Yet this figure, which is not Kipling's exclusive property, is unquestionably an "important image" of late nineteenth-century British imperial culture, one that commands close attention for that very reason. Why, one must ask, does this "boy," this liminal adolescent, become a key figure in the representation of the British imperial enterprise? Why is this "boy" not a man?

It is the project of this thesis to provide answers to these questions by examining the liminal subjectivity of Kipling's "empire boy." Although Kipling's youthful protagonists are invariably male, they are also invariably representatives of a subjectivity that is, in other respects, troubled by indeterminacy, dividedness, undecidability. Their placement in their social world is always uncertain, always open to renegotiation. Their cultural identifications are multiple and incommensurate.

Kipling's representations of the "boy" thus reflect, in my view, a restructuring and refiguring of Western, masculine, imperial subjectivity, a complex transformation of this subjectivity in response to the pressures and demands of the cross-cultural confrontations the imperial enterprise entails. These representations affirm, on the one hand, the creative adaptability of the masculine, imperial subject, the remarkable plasticity and improvisational prowess this subject brings to the making and maintaining of a multicultural empire. Just as surely, however, they manifest a compromise of self-sovereignty and authority, an anxious, deeply unsettled awareness of the imperial subject's inescapably contingent formation and constitution. Kipling's liminal "boy" is a figure who counters yet confirms the fissuring of the masculine, authoritative subjectivity, the very subjectivity upon which a coherent, masculinist envisioning of the imperial project depends.

With a view to providing a cultural and historical context for my subsequent close analysis of Kipling's deployments of the "empire boy," my first chapter interrogates the genealogy of the "boy," outlining the socio-cultural, historical processes that inform and invest the figure, examining the articulation of childhood generally and, more particularly, the articulation of a privileged, prioritized boyhood within the social text of imperial Europe. Chapter two, which focuses on The Jungle Books, analyzes the "boy" as the organizing figure in an allegorization of empire: Mowgli's jungle history re-presents the history of the British in India; an imperial progress is refigured as a boy's life process of growth and maturation. As I demonstrate, more specifically, the Mowgli saga articulates itself as post-Mutiny allegory, organizing itself upon various allusions to the scenes and situations of the 1857 rebellion in India, attempting—with limited success—to resolve and assuage the imperial anxieties investing that historical event. In chapter three I consider the "empire boy" resituated and reproblematized within the context of the English school, revealing how Kipling disrupts the conception of an insular metropolitan culture, by opening this "centre" to the influences and

inscriptions of the imperial "periphery," by rewriting the metropolitan "little world of school" as a "little empire" where schoolboys engage in territorial and discursive power-games. I discover in Kipling's schoolboy an irresolvably ambivalent figure, an insurgent subaltern who (re)enacts the practices of power, a figure in whom images of authority and subalternity come together. Chapter four focuses upon Kim, which I take to be Kipling's most complex engagement with the figure of the boy. Here, the "boy" engages explicitly in the practices of imperial power, exercising the gaze of power, mapping spaces, situating subjects, transgressing and redefining socio-cultural boundaries. The first part of my argument is oriented by Foucauldian theory and examines Kim's role within a post-Mutiny envisioning of a disciplinary order of empire. Having duly noted, within the articulation of this disciplinary order, the disruptive potential of Kim's multivalent "ethnicity," I then undertake an analysis of the ethnographic implications of Kipling's text. This second reading reveals with particular clarity how authoritative imperial subjectivity is compromised and called into question by representations of the liminal "empire boy."

Discovering and Theorizing the Genealogy of the "Boy"

To establish the groundwork of his Culture and Imperialism, Edward Said begins his first chapter by observing that

> Appeals to the past are among the commonest of strategies in interpretations of the present. What animates such appeals is not only disagreement about what happened in the past and what the past was, but uncertainty about whether the past really is past, over and concluded, or whether it continues, albeit in different forms, perhaps. (3)

Working from T. S. Eliot's analysis, in "Tradition and the Individual Talent," of the complex relationship between past and present, between tradition and contemporaneity, Said goes on to clarify what it means to historicize a cultural critique: "[E]ven as we must fully comprehend the pastness of the past," he reflects, "there is no just way in which the past can be quarantined from the present. Past and present inform each other, each implies the other and . . . each co-exists with the other. Neither past nor present . . . has a complete meaning alone" (4).

To situate the figure of the boy within the complex, dynamic interplay of Kipling's "past and present" is the project of this chapter. Its purpose, within the larger context of the thesis as a whole, is to demonstrate that the textual, socio-cultural, and ideological functions of Kipling's "empire boy," which subsequent chapters will consider, are not matters of arbitrary or eccentric ascription. On the contrary, Kipling's representations of imperial boyhood draw upon a richly elaborated cultural repertoire; these representations are informed by a past which they transform. To pose and subsequently to explore the question of the "boy" in Kipling, one must recognize that childhood and boyhood—as we in the "West" have come to know and understand them—have a specific history and that this history is implicated within the process of modern European imperialism. Only in relation with this historical

contextualization does it become possible and, indeed, worthwhile to consider Kipling's work as a particular textual manifestation suggesting broader, more general critical implications and applications. By examining the history of European conceptions of childhood and boyhood, by providing an historical and theoretical account of their emergence within the social text of imperial Europe, one can begin to discover the role of the "child" and, more specifically, of the "boy" in the elaboration and deployment of "a Western epistemology of the subject" (Sharpe), an epistemology whose formation must be understood as an on-going process, still susceptible to critical renegotiation. Within this process, Kipling's work represents neither a beginning nor an end, but rather a significant moment of cultural condensation in which themes and motifs of the "boy" come together in complex, revealing ways and signal their pertinence for contemporary cultural critique. As Satya P. Mohanty emphasizes in his revaluation of Kipling's texts of boyhood, European imperial culture produced "new meanings and identities, some of which in fact survive in many of our postcolonial encounters." It established "relations of rule, deeply ingrained habits, attitudes, even images of self and world, [which] pervade our own current social practices" ("Drawing" 313-14). Kipling's representations of the "boy," which are informed by his cultural past, inform our cultural present.

My documentation of the genealogy of the "boy" strives to show how childhood and boyhood are culturally invested in such a way as to allow for the coding of the "boy" as the privileged, prioritized representative of European childhood and, ultimately, of European imperial subjectivity. I begin by considering the "specialization" of childhood, which centers on the "boy" as a maker and marker of social distinctions. I then proceed to examine the centrality of childhood in modern Europe's "civilizing process," which orients and energizes childhood's specialization, focusing attention on the child—and, in particular, on the boy—as a site of progress, as

the crucial figure upon whom the production and reproduction of new civil and symbolic codes depend. In relation to the civilizing process, adult identification with and investment in the figure of the child, implicitly evident in my analysis of childhood's specialization, is revealed more clearly. In this respect, the pedagogy of John Locke, which advocates the transmission of civilized dispositions and behaviors by example and imitation, is shown to be particularly instructive. I argue, moreover, that Locke's contribution lends philosophical credence to the figure of the child, offering an abundantly detailed account of the child's "Nature" and "Character."

Following my examination of Locke, I go on to show how and why the "boy" comes to be implicated in the expansion of Europe. Noting, first, Elias's observation that "civilization" is a key concept organizing European imperialist projects, I subsequently document the production of the "child" as an organizing figure in discourses that address questions of cross-cultural encounter between "civilized" and "savage" worlds. Of crucial importance in this respect is the contribution of Rousseau, whose work establishes the "boy" as the subject-in-process of imperial Europe. Rousseau codes the "boy" first in relation to the Carib other and subsequently in relation to the European colonial adventurer, delineating a progress that culminates with the confirmation of Europe and European subjectivity as privileged sites of knowledge and initiative within an emergent global community. He makes clear, moreover, that the enterprising "child" of an expanding Europe is definitively and exclusively a "boy."

Employing Johannes Fabian's illuminating analysis of "allochronism" in modern discourses of culture, I go on to argue that Rousseau's particular production of the "boy" signals and enables a Eurocentric distribution of differentiated cultural and subjective temporalities. At this juncture, I confront and call into question the tropes of the "primitive child" and the "childlike primitive." Similarly, I consider the "boy" as an overdetermined and potentially unstable figure uneasily negotiating the difference

between the time of Europe and the time of the Other. Returning then to the British cultural context of the later eighteenth century, I make use of recent scholarship by Sara Suleri to propose Edmund Burke's representation and denunciation of "boy"-imperialism in India as a key manifestation of the "boy"'s capacity to serve and yet to unsettle imperial discourse.

Burke, in my view, confirms the "boy" as a key figure of British imperial discourse, yet presents the "empire boy" as a problematizing rather than an enabling element of that discourse. I therefore proceed to document the recuperation of the "boy," first noting the importance of Mill's and Macaulay's discourse of an irrational and malevolent Indian "archaic." Considering the burgeoning of adventure and school narratives both in books and in boys' magazines, I establish the "empire boy" as a prominent, organizing figure within late nineteenth-century British cultural production. Having traced the progress of the "boy" through to Kipling's time of writing, I raise questions of the gaze, of the boy as gazer, using Fabian's concept of "visualism" to orient an analysis of the visual and spectacular representation of empire in late nineteenth-century British popular culture, which John M. MacKenzie has recently documented. I then argue the mutually sustaining relationship of visual and literary representation, finding in the "boy" a figure mediating a predominantly visual "experience" of the British imperial actions and achievements. First affirming that the "boy" represents the possibility of a coherent envisioning of the relationship between British subjectivity and the British imperial project, I conclude this chapter's discussion with a brief introduction to Lacanian theory of the Imaginary and Symbolic orders, the theory that will orient and inform much of my subsequent analysis of Kipling's fictions of imperial adolescence.

In Centuries of Childhood, Philippe Ariès outlines the history of "the specialized child," a crucial development enabling the child's emergence as a specific, recognizable

figure within the cultural image-repertoire of modern Europe. The envisioning of childhood as a special and specifiable time of life is, Ariès argues, a distinctly modern notion. Analyzing the evidence of the visual arts, he affirms that the "discovery" of childhood

> began in the thirteenth century, and its progress can be traced in the history of art in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. But the evidence of its development became more plentiful and significant from the end of the sixteenth century and throughout the seventeenth. (46)

Ariès emphasizes the importance of the seventeenth century in childhood's modern evolution. References to "children's jargon" abounded in the texts of the period. Similarly, "portraits of children ... became numerous and commonplace" (46); "the family portrait, a much older genre, tended to plan itself around the child" (46-47); "childhood scenes" provided topics of interest to both painters and engravers (47). Examination of these artistic renderings reveals that, by the seventeenth century, "the child, or at least the child of quality, whether noble or middle class," had acquired his specialized dress; "henceforth he had an outfit reserved for his age group, which set him apart from the adult" (50).

The specialization of European childhood progresses steadily through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, becoming both more elaborate and more exacting. The child's person—his clothing, the cut of his hair—is made to reflect, ever more meticulously, his age and class. Specific playthings, games, and pastimes are relinquished by adults and enclosed within childhood's sphere. Child-focused systems of education develop, claiming more and more of the child's time and attention. The schoolboy is uniformed, sequestered from society at large and segregated from his fellows, as educational institutions take on a disciplinary and normalizing character. Moreover, "[t]he substitution of the school for apprenticeship"—the earlier institution

for social initiation—coincides with the development of the modern, child-centered family (369), a very private institution that "cuts itself off from the world and opposes to society the isolated group of parents and children" (404). Both at home and at school, the child is surrounded by the various discourses that specify his being: learned voices debate as to his native innocence or depravity; manuals of etiquette dictate his behavior; myriad prescriptions and proscriptions govern his health and hygiene. Unlike his medieval predecessor, the modern child is subjected to special treatment and training—"a sort of quarantine" (Ariès 412). "Family and school together," Ariès concludes,

> removed the child from adult society. The school shut up a childhood that had hitherto been free within an increasingly severe disciplinary system.... The solicitude of family, Church, moralists and administrators deprived the child of the freedom he had hitherto enjoyed among adults. (413)

As this brief outline of childhood's modern history begins to suggest, the child's specialization, isolation and segregation have noteworthy implications with respect to issues of gender and class. If I have chosen, thus far, to specify the "child" as male, it is with good reason: "boys," Ariès stresses, "were the first specialized children" (58). "[T]he particularization of children," he goes on to say, "was limited for a long time to boys," and "it occurred solely in middle-class or aristocratic families" (61). In terms of dress, the difference between the boy and man of the upper classes is clearly marked, the difference between girl and woman relatively unmarked. Lower-class children of both genders are dressed in the same manner as the adults. By the late sixteenth century, many upper-class boys are going to school; whereas, few girls are schooled before the late eighteenth century. The social initiation of lower-class children through apprenticeship and service continues well into the nineteenth century. As for festive and leisure activities, Ariès observes, "At first the same games were

common to all ages and classes." What follows subsequently, however, "is the abandonment of these games by the adults of the upper classes and their survival among both the lower classes and the children of the upper classes" (99).

The specialization of the child is a way of making social distinctions and marking their importance—a way of making differences signify. The most important difference, the one that is most clearly and insistently marked, is that which distinguishes the upper-class boy from the man of the same class. The specialized child's dress offers, in this regard, the most revealing instance. As Ariès points out,

> dress pin-pointed the place of the wearer in a complex and undisputed hierarchy: a man wore the costume of his rank, and the etiquette books laid a great emphasis on the impropriety of dressing in any other way than that befitting one's age or birth. Every social nuance had its corresponding sign in clothing. (57)

Now, from the sixteenth century on, the upper-class boy's dress, by the very fact of its specialization, marks his difference from boys of other, lower classes. It distinguishes him much less from lower class men, and still less from the girls and women of his own class. Ariès notes "archaizing and effeminizing" tendencies in the history of boyhood's specialized costume (59). "[T]o distinguish the child," he observes, "features of old-fashioned costumes which the grown-ups had abandoned . . . were reserved for his sole use" (56). The boy is thus associated with lower-class adults, who also take up the cast-off fashions—often, literally, the cast-off clothes—of their social superiors. In early childhood, the "boy of quality" is dressed like the girl, who, for her part, "[is] not distinguished from the woman" (58).

The specialization of upper-class boyhood is evidently caught up in a quite complex play of similarity and difference: the specialized boy is marked in ways that suggest his similarity (in status terms) to the girls and women of his own class, to the adults of lower classes, and his difference from boys of lower classes and from the men of his

own class. The specialization of boyhood serves, most notably, to distinguish and specify a privileged boyhood and a privileged manhood. Moreover, if one considers the history of dress in relation to the birth and development of the school, it becomes evident that the empowered adulthood of the upper-class male is not only a function of age, it is a distinction one achieves by means of an extensive and demanding process of initiation. Boyhood's specialization produces a culturally coded figure, the "boy," whose role it is to make and mark key social distinctions, to render visible and meaningful the specification and hierarchization of various social subjects. It is the special capacity of the "boy" to figure forth distinctions in social status and degrees of privilege and empowerment.[1]

Ariès, in his largely phenomenological account, makes no sustained or systematic attempt to isolate the motive forces energizing the history of childhood's specialization. This specialization is, however, deeply implicated in a still more radical transformation of European culture. As Norbert Elias has shown in his two-volume work, The

---

[1]Certainly, Ariès's account of childhood's history has not gone entirely unchallenged. In "The Evolution of Childhood," Lloyd DeMause, perhaps the most notable anti-Ariès scholar of childhood, questions the thesis of childhood's "invention." According to DeMause, the assertion, grounded in the study of medieval art, that "a separate concept of childhood was unknown" in the society of the early Middle Ages, "leave[s] the art of antiquity in limbo" and, moreover, "ignores voluminous evidence that medieval artists could, indeed, paint realistic children." Similarly, the "etymological argument"--founded upon the observation that the word "child" has come to have, in modern times, a more specific and delimited meaning--"is untenable." "[T]he notion of the 'invention of childhood'," DeMause concludes, "is so fuzzy that it is surprising that so many historians have recently picked it up" (5). DeMause does not, however, offer any challenge to Ariès's fundamental, and for me, most compelling thesis: childhood, beginning in the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, was subjected to profound transformations, what Ariès calls its "specialization." In my view, this specialization of childhood constitutes, if not its "discovery" or "invention," at least its rediscovery or reinvention, its culturally significant reconstruction in new terms and along new lines.

Civilizing Process, fifteenth-century Europe—that is, Europe in the early period of childhood's specialization—is already engaged in an increasingly intensified, increasingly far-reaching process of civilization, which, in various ways, will do much to determine and define the European community's accession to its "modernity." "Civilization" as cultural process and "civility" as social value are in the process of establishing themselves as central, organizing principles of European society. National identities, unified by language, by law and by religion, are emerging, as are the internally pacified, externally embattled, modern nation-states—most notably in England and in France, nations that early established secure and stable frontiers. As Elias makes clear, the "civilizing" of peoples entails a decreased reliance upon violent force, which becomes an exclusive, legal prerogative of the monarch, and an increased "socio-genetic" demand for the individual subject's internalization of social codes and etiquettes. Within the civilized nation-state, social control is an effect of the tacitly acknowledged interdependence of individuals, each of whom must exercise ever-increasing degrees of drive-control and self-constraint. Elias thus anticipates the work of Michel Foucault by documenting the formation of a "civilized subject," who, having been submitted to a complex play of social demands and pressures, "assumes responsibility for the constraints of power" and "becomes the principle of his own subjection" (Foucault, Discipline 202-3).

As Elias points out, questions of civility arise around the child: "the concept of civilité . . . owes the specific meaning adopted by society to a short treatise by Erasmus . . . De civilitate morum puerilium (On civility in children)" (I 53). Prominent among the productions of the sixteenth-century press were books of etiquette or "good manners" instituted by De civilitate (1526) and Erasmus's earlier Colloquia (1516), both of which enjoyed a tremendous, pan-European vogue. For Erasmus, the child and the youth provide the foundational, focal points for the discourse of civility: as its exigencies become more exacting and complex, civility becomes a matter of

specific and protracted instruction, an interrelated assembly of dispositions and behaviors that must be learned in childhood and taught, in turn, to each new generation. To specify what the uncivilized child must learn is to specify what the civilized adult must know. Civilized adults become, therefore, ever more attentive to their own deportment, and exert themselves to inculcate "corresponding behavior-patterns in children. From earliest youth the individual is trained in the constant restraint and foresight that he needs for adult functions" (Elias, II 241). Concern with the proper formation of the young person of quality (who is most commonly figured as a young male) continues to inform the many works on civility that accompany those of Erasmus—Russell's Book of Nurture, Caxton's Book of Curtesye, Della Casa's Galateo, Castiglione's Courtier, to name only a few (see Elias, I 60-61, 79-80).

The civilizing process, as Elias perceives, must necessarily organize itself around the child. The civilized adult's susceptibility to shame and socio-genetic anxiety—a susceptibility that is, as it were, the sine qua non of individual civilization—

> results from the fact that the people whose superiority one fears are in accord with one's own super-ego, with the agency of self-constraint implanted in the individual by others on whom he was dependent, who possessed power and superiority over him. (II 292)

Elias, in fact, goes so far as to affirm that "all forms of adult inner anxieties are bound with the child's fears of others, of external powers" (II 300). Thus, in Elias's view,

> the specific process of psychological "growing up" in Western societies . . . is nothing other than the individual civilizing process to which each young person, as a result of the social civilizing process over many centuries, is automatically subjected from earliest childhood . . . . (I xiii)

And, most importantly perhaps, because the attainment of a high level of "civilization" is a matter of prestige and power, children become focal points of class anxieties, aspirations, and struggles:

> The continuous concern of parents whether their child will attain the standard of conduct of their own or even a higher class, whether it will maintain or increase the prestige of the family, whether it will hold its own in the competition within their own class, fears of this kind surround the child from its earliest years . . . [and] play a considerable part in the control to which the child is subject from the beginning, in the prohibitions placed on him. (II 329-30)

The child, that is to say, becomes the principal means of asserting, claiming, and maintaining class power.

The civilizing of the child poses itself as an educational problem, as is confirmed by the growing importance of schooling in modern European societies. Yet the school is not the only site where childhood is carefully watched, shaped, and corrected. The privatized, child-centered family has also, as Ariès notes, an important educational function. Even before the end of the seventeenth century, the boy's education within the familial setting becomes a topic worthy of a philosopher's subtlety and seriousness. In Some Thoughts Concerning Education, first published in 1693, John Locke proposes various methods of educational discipline for application in the (upper-class) home, outlining a pedagogy "suited to our English Gentry," which engages with the problem of forming a "Gentleman" from a "Gentleman's Son" (lxiii).

For Locke, the principal purpose of an education is the production or, more precisely, the reproduction of reasoned and disciplined "Civility," which the philosopher considers the indispensable foundation of good citizenry. His methods aim to instill in the child "Habits woven into the very Principles of his Nature" (28), an end

to be attained through a "Practice" governed by appropriate "Example." Observing "how prone we all are, especially Children, to Imitation" (51), Locke argues,

> of all the Ways whereby Children are to be instructed, and their Manners formed, the plainest, easiest, and most efficacious, is, to set before their Eyes the Examples of those things you would have them do, or avoid; which, when pointed out to them, in the Practice of Persons within their Knowledge . . . are of more Force to draw or deter their Imitation, than any Discourses which can be made to them. (61)

Although the fundamentals of Locke's educational goals and methods can be clearly discerned and simply stated, his philosophical confrontation with the child is somewhat divided in its premises: on the one hand, his pedagogy is oriented by the famous premise that posits the childish mind as a "blank slate" to be inscribed by experience, "as white Paper, or Wax, to be moulded and fashioned as one pleases" (187); on the other hand, his teaching repeatedly implies or explicitly asserts the existence of a specifiable childish "Nature" to be reformed as much as made. Locke, in his discussion, finds occasion to extoll the "Child's Spirit" as "easy, active, and free" (30) or to observe, disparagingly, that "Inadvertency, Forgetfulness, Unsteadiness, and Wandering of Thought, are the natural Faults of Childhood" (144). Locke's child, then, is not an empty figure but (within certain limits) a malleable one.

The pedagogical project obliges the philosopher to characterize childhood's estate, to submit it to a detailed descriptive account. Not only does Locke picture the child engaged in his various life-activities—whipping his top, playing at alphabetized dice, reciting his lesson, socializing in various situations with adults and peers—he also sets down an abundant catalogue of childish dispositions, susceptibilities, and inclinations, including "Lying and Equivocations" (24), desire for "Esteem" and fear of "Disgrace" (34), "Obstinacy" and "Rebellion" (57), love of "Liberty" and of "Power and Dominion" (83), keen, virtually boundless "Curiosity" (87), a tendency to "clamour"

and "complain" (88-9), "Fool-hardiness" (94), "Timorousness" (97-100), "Cruelty" and delight in "Mischief" (100-01), but also "Benignity and Compassion" (102), "Pertness" (106), a dangerous disposition to "sauntering" and "trifling" (106) fortunately counterbalanced by a naturally "busy Humour," a constant need to be active and engaged (110-11). Of course, these many and various traits or tendencies are not the exclusive property of children. As Locke emphasizes, the child, even in his nonage, is already a human being and therefore not essentially different from the adult. He distinguishes childhood by specifying certain recognizably human characteristics, which may or may not appear in the adult, as salient and more or less invariable in the child. A key role of Lockean education is, precisely, to determine what qualities are to endure, to what degree and in what form. Locke, moreover, freely acknowledges that each child manifests a specific distribution and configuration of childish traits, an individual "Temper" composed of "predominate Passions and prevailing Inclinations" (82-3). It is, above all, these "native Propensities" that the parent or tutor must carefully observe and keep in account. The educator must read "the Characters of [the child's] Mind . . . in the first Scenes of his Life" (83).

That Locke's injunction to closely observe the child should culminate with theatrical metaphors is telling: his treatment makes the child readable in figurative terms, placing the child, as it were, in a prominent role upon the stage of social life. Certainly, Locke does not, in pursuit of his educational, civilizing project, invent the modern figure of the child. Resonant evocations of childhood and the child abound in the works of earlier, widely disseminated and highly influential writers such as Erasmus, Shakespeare and Montaigne.[2] With Locke, however, the specification and

---

[2]The influence of Montaigne's essays, especially the essays on educational topics ("Of Pedantry" and "Of the Education of Children"), is noteworthy. As R. H. Quick, in his "Introduction" to Some Thoughts Concerning Education, notes numerous "parallel passages" linking Locke's treatise to the texts of the Essays (Locke lix). Quick goes so

delineation of childhood and the child become tenable matters for philosophical discourse. The "child" attains dignity as a philosophical distinction, as a figure available to, and worthy of, reasoned contemplation and analysis. Just as importantly, Locke confirms and consolidates the specular relationship between the child and the adult. The child observed reveals not only his native character, but also, crucially, the progress of his reform, reveals, that is, the degree to which his character and deportment reflect the examples provided him by his parents, his tutor—by all those persons who make up his "Company." For Locke, the adult is the subject and, just as importantly, the object of a gaze. The strait ligatures of direct responsibility bind the adult to the developing child:

> You must do nothing before him, which you would not have him imitate. If any Thing escape you, which you would have pass for a Fault in him, he will be sure to shelter himself under your Example, and shelter himself so as that it will not be easy to come at him, to correct it in him the right Way. (51)

The child's education advances in so far as he comes to mirror the dispositions, behaviors, values—in short, the various civilizing examples—presented to him by civilized adults. Locke's educational philosophy thus confirms what Erasmus had earlier intuited—that the child figures forth the nature and level of the socio-cultural achievement a civilizing society has attained.[3]

---

far as to suggest that "the chief importance of the Thoughts is due to the prominence given by Locke to truths which had already been set forth by Montaigne" (li).

[3]I should mention here the enormous success of Locke's little book both in Britain and on the continent. Sommerville notes that it rapidly "became the most popular book on child rearing in its day, with at least 26 editions before 1800. It had a European reputation, enjoying 16 French editions in that same period, as well as 6 Italian editions and translations into Dutch, German, Swedish, and Spanish." Sommerville adds, pertinently, that "Locke did not have to wait to be discovered; the public was ready for his views" (121).

To speak of civilization as cultural achievement is, to a certain degree, to anticipate transformations of the conception and deployment of "civilisation" that occur after Locke's time, in the latter half of the eighteenth century. As Elias observes, the term "civilisation" is first derived from the earlier terms, "civilised" and "civility," to denote a cultural process. In publications of the 1770s, "civilisation" first asserts itself as "an indispensable term that is obviously generally understood" (Elias, I 46). Although it never entirely loses its association with process and progress, its reference to "something which is constantly in motion, constantly moving 'forward'" (I 5), by the end of the eighteenth century the term, with ever greater clarity and conviction, comes "to epitomize the nation, to express the national self-image" (I 49). "Civilisation" thus emerges, particularly in England and France, as the name for a pre-eminent national, socio-cultural achievement. "It expresses," writes Elias, "the self-assurance of peoples whose national boundaries and national identity have for centuries been . . . fully established . . . , peoples which have long expanded outside their borders and colonized beyond them" (I 5); it characterizes the modern European, imperial nation-state. As an established concept, civilization henceforth "expresses the self-consciousness of the West":

> It sums up everything in which Western society of the last two or three centuries believes itself superior to earlier societies or "more primitive" contemporary ones. By this term Western society seeks to describe what constitutes its special character and what it is proud of: the level of its technology, the nature of its manners, the development of its scientific knowledge or view of the world, and much more. (I 3-4)

As the watchword of a specifically Western ethnocentrism, "civilisation" takes on "a level of meaning justifying . . . aspirations to national expansion and colonization" (I 49). First deployed, in various forms and in various ways, as the exclusive property of specific dominant or ascendant groups—the courtly aristocracy and later the gentry and,

still later, the bourgeoisie—civilization is finally applied to the nation as a whole. Formerly informing confrontations and competitions between classes within the emergent nation-states, the concept of civilization now serves increasingly to distinguish the nations of imperial Europe from cultural others in the colonial world:

> Unlike the situation when the concept was formed, from now on nations consider the process of civilization as completed within their own societies; they see themselves as bearers of an existing or finished civilization to others, as standard-bearers of expanding civilization. . . . And the consciousness of their own superiority, the consciousness of this "civilization," from now on serves at least those nations which have become colonial conquerors . . . as a justification of their rule, to the same degree that earlier the ancestors of the concept of civilization, politesse and civilité, had served the courtly-aristocratic upper-class as a justification of theirs. (I 50).

Just as the figure of the child focuses and organizes the class competition attending the civilizing process, so the figure, as I will now argue, takes a prominent place in the expansive, hegemonic initiatives of civilizing Europe. Indeed, even before the consolidation of the concept of civilization (as a European cultural achievement) the figure is made to serve as a sense-making device in the articulation of cultural difference. Modern childhood begins to manifest itself in an "Age of Discovery." Its evolution continues throughout the period of modern colonial expansion. With the discovery of the Americas and the consequent pan-European awareness of the American "primitive," the emergence of modern childhood becomes more and more deeply implicated in Europe's discovery and domination of its cultural others.

Although it was already possible for Luther, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, to describe his children—fondly, indulgently—as "little heathens" (Sommerville 89), the intimate and insistent association of the child and the primitive cultural other does not seem to follow immediately upon the "New World" discovery. Bartolomé de Las Casas, a missionary and a contemporary of Luther, writes

extensively of Caribbean peoples without evoking the figure of the child (see Abellán). Later in the same century, Montaigne makes no explicit use of the figure when he first essays the question of the primitive in his "Of Cannibals." As José Luis Abellán has observed, however, the idea of the "noble savage" (which will later allow Rousseau to establish the conceptual bond between the child and the "savage") is already present in the work of both Las Casas and Montaigne.[4] Both writers are concerned with comparing and contrasting the "savage" Carib and the "civilized" European; both laud the former and tend to disparage the latter. And the idealistic rhetoric arising around the "noble savage" has, unquestionably, its equivalent in discourse of the child.

In "Of Cannibals," Montaigne declares,

> These nations [of the New World] ... seem to me barbarous in this sense, that they have been fashioned very little by the human mind, and are still very close to their original naturalness. The laws of nature still rule them, very little corrupted by ours . . . . [I]t seems to me that what we actually see in these nations surpasses . . . all the pictures in which poets have idealized the golden age and all their inventions in imagining a happy state of man . . . . (I.31.153)

A discourse of childhood is implicit in this passage. Montaigne's account of the New World peoples parallels the representation of the child with which it is roughly contemporary, as is evident if one considers this excerpt from "The Child," the opening sketch of John Earle's Microcosmographie (1628):

> [The Child] is the best copy of Adam before he tasted of Eve or the apple .... He is nature's fresh picture newly drawn in oil, which time, and much

---

[4]Abellán does not, however, limit his discussion to Las Casas and Montaigne. In tracing the genealogy of the savagery/ civilization opposition, he also draws attention to the work of other writers of the early sixteenth century: Pedro Mártir de Anglería, Luis Vives and, most notably, Antonio de Guevara, whom Abellán considers "the true author of the barbary-civilization opposition that gives positive meaning to the first term and perjorative meaning to the second" (410, my translation).

> handling, dims and defaces. His soul is yet a white paper unscribbled with observations of the world .... He is purely happy, because he knows no evil, nor hath made means by sin to be acquainted with misery (qtd. in Boas 42).

When, at the end of his essay, Montaigne offers his final ironic reflection upon the Caribs' "otherness"—"They don't wear breeches"—one can begin to discern the "child" waiting, as it were, in the wings. The difference, one recalls, between the modern, specialized boy and the European adult male is also, in part, a matter of breeches.

The "child" need not wait long. In "Of Coaches," an essay composed only a few years after "Of Cannibals," Montaigne turns again to New World reflections:

> Our world has just discovered another world ... no less great, full, and well-limbed than itself, yet so new and so infantile that it is still being taught its A B C; not fifty years ago it knew neither letters, nor weights and measures, nor clothes, nor wheat, nor vines. It was still quite naked at the breast, and lived only on what its nursing mother provided. ... It was an infant world; yet we have not whipped it and subjected it to our discipline by the advantage of our natural valor and strength, nor won it over by our justice and goodness, nor subjugated it by our magnanimity. (III.6.693)

Montaigne here conceives of "Old" (adult) and "New" (infantile) worlds. Like the European child, the New World is being submitted (perhaps rudely and unjustly) to a process of civilizing education. Montaigne, however, orders his discourse upon a comparison of "worlds" and does not, therefore, strike precisely upon the metaphoric link—the child is a primitive; the primitive is a child—which interests me most. The work of Montaigne (and of Las Casas and others) clearly demonstrates, nonetheless, that when Rousseau, in his Émile of 1762, philosophizes upon the bond that joins the "noble savage" and the "natural" child, his contribution confirms and consolidates as much as it inaugurates and innovates.

Montaigne's use of "childhood" in his representation of the Carib is by no means "innocent," revealing as it does a noteworthy bias in European perception of cultural

others. In the work of Rousseau, however, this bias discovers its potential philosophical and pedagogical implications. The opening pages of Émile announce, "Our wisdom is slavish prejudice, our customs consist in control, constraint, compulsion. Civilized man is born and dies a slave. . . . All his life long man is imprisoned by our institutions." As the disaffected philosopher is quick to add, "The Caribs are better off than we are" (10). Rousseau is not the first to think and argue in terms of this civilized/savage opposition, but he is the first to offer an alternative educational methodology based upon it. He posits the "savage" Carib as the free and self-sufficient "natural man," who "lives for himself," who "is the unit, the whole" (7). Working from this premise and using the "savage" as his touchstone, Rousseau proffers his "education from nature" and, in so doing, places the child, his learning experience and knowledge acquisition, in intimate relation with the cultural contexts of European imperial expansion.

It is important to note at the outset that, despite repeated invocations of the "savage" as a principal organizing example, Rousseau's pedagogy represents an intensification rather than a relaxation of civilizing systems of restraint and control. Notably, the watchfulness required of Emile's tutor is at once more unremitting and more surreptitious than that prescribed by Locke. The tutor's responsibilities demand unprecedented levels of self-discipline and self-consciousness, because, just as the boy is ever in his eye, so he is always in the boy's. The tutor and the boy are both caught up in a disciplinary process that produces subjection in the name of freedom, that binds the adult educator more closely and more subtly to his childish charge: Rousseau exhorts the tutor,

> let [the pupil] always think he is master while you are really master. There is no subjection so complete as that which preserves the forms of freedom; it is thus that the will itself is taken captive. Is not this poor child, without knowledge, strength, or wisdom, entirely at your mercy? Are you not master of his whole environment so far as it affects him? Cannot you make of him

> what you please? His work and play, his pleasure and pain, are they not, unknown to him, under your control? No doubt he ought only to do what he wants, but he ought to want to do nothing but what you want him to do. He should never take a step you have not foreseen, nor utter a word you could not foretell. (84-85)

Rousseau cannot do without the disciplinary techniques developed within the civilizing process; nor can he entirely overturn or abandon the paradigms of European civility. As Elias notes, "Rousseau launched the most radical attack on the dominant order of values of his time . . . . But Rousseau, for all the radicalism of his social criticism, had not yet fashioned an inclusive, unified counterconcept against which to hurl the accumulated reproaches" (I 39).

The French philosopher does not ignore the child's inevitable destiny as a "citizen." In the end, Émile can only be made to embody an alternative civility formulated in terms of different touchstones, notably "nature" and the "natural man." However, unlike Locke ("that wise man" [22] whom Rousseau cites frequently) whose goal is to form an "English Gentleman," Rousseau looks beyond the bounds of nation and class, aiming to produce "a citizen of the world" (20). This new envisioning of the scope of citizenship tellingly signals the participation of Rousseau's pedagogy in the process of European expansion.

In the first two books of Émile, the expansive, potentially imperial energies of Rousseau's text assert themselves immediately, yet not obstreperously. Rousseau establishes that his young scholar's education is driven by need and desire, directed by curiosity. And although he proposes the increasing attainment of "self-sufficiency" (the same self-sufficiency he has previously ascribed to the Carib "savage") as the educative goal and asserts that "freedom, not power is the greatest good" (48), Rousseau follows Locke in ascribing to the child "a natural love of power" (34), which must be properly directed and put to use. Pre-eminent, therefore, among the child's earliest apprehensions is the proper judgement and appreciation of distance—of the distance

that separates the child from the objects of need, desire, curiosity, from the objects over which the child would gain a certain dominion.

In Book III, Rousseau remains true to his preceding logic. Émile, at the age of twelve or thirteen, begins to acquire what might properly be called "knowledges," the first of which, significantly, is to be geography. "Man's diverse powers," Rousseau proposes,

> are stirred by the same instinct. . . . Children are first restless, then curious; and this curiosity, rightly directed, is the means of development for the age with which we are dealing. . . . There is a zeal for learning which has no other foundation than a wish to appear learned, and there is another which springs from man's natural curiosity about all things far or near which may affect himself. . . . If a man of science were left on a desert island with his books and instruments and knowing that he must spend the rest of his life there, he would scarcely trouble himself about the solar system, the laws of attraction, or the differential calculus. He might never even open a book again; but he would never rest till he had explored the furthest corner of his island, however large it might be. (130)

Having proposed this hypothetical scenario, Rousseau greatly extends and expands its scope, at the same moment that he reintroduces the touchstone of "savagery": he proposes, "Our island is the earth," and, in accord with "the philosophy of most savage races," proposes to direct Émile's attention to cosmic phenomena. Taking, then, a moment to anticipate and answer objections, Rousseau writes,

> What a sudden change you will say. Just now we were concerned with what touches ourselves, with our immediate environment, and all at once we are exploring the round world and leaping to the bounds of the universe. This change is the result of our growing strength and of the natural bent of the mind. While we were weak and feeble, self-preservation concentrated our attention on ourselves; now that we are strong and powerful, the desire for a wider sphere carries us beyond ourselves as far as our eyes can reach. (130)

The sudden, explosive expansion of the educational context is indeed startling, but not inexplicable. Already, in the mid-eighteenth century, it is evidently possible for the "Subject of Europe"—Gayatri Spivak's formulation—to constitute a sphere of knowledge coextensive with the sphere of the Earth. Rousseau is a staunch advocate of empirical knowledge acquisition: "Let the senses be the only guide for the first workings of reason" (131). With Magellan's sixteenth-century circumnavigation of the globe, "the round world" to which Rousseau alludes has become an experience, an empirical reality. If Africa remains for the most part the "dark continent"—or, better still, the blank, undifferentiated space Conrad's Marlowe will remember—yet the European presence is already established in Asia and in both continents of the New World. Rousseau's text, which makes frequent use of "you" and "we" in its address, solicits a dual identification, a dual participation, appealing to its readers as subjects of an educational project and as subjects of the European community, which is expanding and extending its knowledge and power. Europe is in the midst of forging the modern geopolitic, and, as his pedagogy reveals, Rousseau is very sensitive to his historical context. He makes clear that the Earth itself, in its entirety, has become the topos of a knowledge imperium. This imperium, moreover, is envisioned as the inevitable (and therefore legitimate) result of "man's natural curiosity about all things far or near which may affect himself" acting in tandem with his growing strength and power and consequent "desire for a wider sphere." The educational progress of the growing child can therefore provide a singularly compelling figure for the expanding dominions of European knowledge and power. "No book, but the world," Rousseau advocates (131). The educational project involves moving the child out and about, increasing in scope and in detail his grasp of the "book" of the world. Mapping the world, both figuratively and literally, is to be the work of experience, never the substitute for experience:

> You wish to teach this child geography and you provide him with globes, spheres, and maps. What elaborate preparations! What is the use of all these symbols; why not begin by showing him the real thing so that he may at least know what you talking about? (131)

The boy learns by direct engagement with his world, by undertaking, in the manner of Robinson Crusoe, the explorations, assimilations, and appropriations that constitute the process of the "education from nature," an education that reproduces in little Europe's imperial progress.

Rousseau's implicit allusion to Robinson Crusoe is by no means haphazard. A few pages later, Rousseau will refer, explicitly and laudatorily, to Defoe's novel, undertaking an extensive development of the Crusoe analogy and "mak[ing] a reality of that desert island which formerly served as an illustration" (147). Robinson Crusoe, one learns, will be Émile's first and, for a long while, his only book. The boy will learn by playing at being Crusoe, by identifying with him—"Let him think he is Robinson himself" (148)—by discovering and solving problems and questions as Crusoe does. In keeping with the Crusoe paradigm, to see the global "island," to access its various spaces, is to know it, to appropriate it, to master it; expansion, the forging of new dominions, is the "natural" correlate of exploration. Rousseau, making a highly significant decision, chooses to model the boy between twelve and fifteen, the boy in "the third stage of childhood" (128) and at the beginnings of adolescence, upon Crusoe, in whom Martin Green locates the seminal inscription of the "modern system hero" as colonial adventurer. Crusoe, in Green's view, provides an "energizing myth" for modern imperialism (3 ff.), affirming the European adventurer's unique capacity to sustain himself, "to create value," and to enact a property-oriented "relationship of possession" in an alien wilderness (76-77). As Green notes, Defoe's hero, at least in the initiatory stages of his adventurings, is prototypically a "young man," the restless and somewhat reckless youth with whom the themes of "empire, frontier, [and]

exploration" will be, after Defoe, closely associated (83). Significantly, however, Rousseau's early redeployment of Defoe's tale "rejuvenates" the figure of its hero, recreating Robinson, the young man, as Émile, the boy in early adolescence. Rousseau, who follows Montaigne in positing a "natural" analogical relation between the Carib savage and the child, thus proceeds to associate and identify the child with another quite distinct figure: the child, at a crucial stage of his development, learns to progress beyond the paradigm of noble savagery and to become like the colonial adventurer, who innovatively confronts the strangeness of his world, creating value and establishing an increasing dominion over his environment. By coding the child in analogical relation first with the savage and, subsequently, with the colonial adventurer—the European who makes his way in alien territory—Rousseau in part creates and in part consolidates the "child" as an instrumental figure for emerging discourses of European colonialism.

Just as importantly, Rousseau asserts the necessary maleness of this enterprising child. Unlike Locke, who merely ignores the case of the girl, Rousseau argues, explicitly and at length, the girl's exclusion from the core of his discussion, confirming the systemic, rather than merely arbitrary, character of this exclusion. He makes no mention of "Sophy, or Woman," until Book V, when Émile, having attained to manhood, is ready to discover and pursue his need of her (321). "Up to the age of puberty," Rousseau affirms at the beginning of Book IV, "children of both sexes have little to distinguish them . . . girls are children and boys are children; one name is enough for creatures so closely resembling one another" (172). Opening Book V, he similarly affirms that a woman differs from a man only with respect to her sex, but then immediately emphasizes the inescapable and far-reaching implications of that one distinction. Arguing that gender differences are and should be complementary, he quickly states that "the man should be strong and active" (as Émile has been trained to be); "the woman should be weak and passive" (322). Similarly, the man is destined

by nature to be "free and self-controlled," the woman to be socially governed, her "boundless passions" restrained by the feminine dispositions of "modesty" and "shame" (323). Not surprisingly, Rousseau's woman is not made to be "a citizen of the world," but rather a mother, a charming companion who cares for children and accepts a general responsibility for the domestic sphere. Having described the natural character and role of woman in very conventional terms, Rousseau returns to questions of childhood and training, paradoxically discovering significant differences between the boys and girls whom he had previously characterized as being essentially similar in every way: "Boys want movement and noise, drums, tops, toy-carts; girls prefer things which appeal to the eye—mirrors, jewellery, finery, and specially dolls. The doll is the girl's special plaything; this shows her instinctive bent towards her life's work" (330-31). Similarly, "Little girls dislike learning to read and write"—skills which Émile, of course, duly acquires—"but they are always ready to learn to sew" (331). One learns, among other things, that girls are usually more curious than boys and more in need of restraint, "more docile than boys" and more in need of authority (331-32). Not self-sufficiency but dependence and uncomplaining, unquestioning obedience are to be Sophy's lot, which is prescribed for her by nature as the distinguishing character of her "sex":

> [Sophy] is gentle and submissive . . . . [S]he endures patiently the wrong-doing of others, and she is eager to atone for her own. This amiability is natural to her sex when unspoiled. Woman is made to submit to man and to endure even injustice at his hands. You will never bring young lads to this; their feelings rise in revolt against injustice; nature has not fitted them to put up with it. (359).

Sophy's potentialities as a human being and as an educable subject are so severely limited as to obviate her exclusion from the pedagogical regime that so clearly implicates Émile, the boy, in the thematics of adventure and empire. It is boyhood

exclusively that Rousseau associates with the noble, uncorrupted, childlike Carib and with Crusoe, the European whose solitary experience upon a Caribbean island obliges him to become as a child again, to recreate and reconstitute the forms and values of his cultural heritage.

Before and even after he is invested in the trappings of the colonial adventurer, Émile is represented as "natural man" receiving an "education from nature." Rousseau, throughout the duration of his pedagogical narrative, considers boyhood in imaginative relation with the Other—with "uncivilized" non-European subjectivity and with non-European places and experiences. The association of the European childhood with the cultural Other is sustained by the notion of a shared time, a time that is posited as distinct from that of European adulthood. What distinguishes the child from the cultural other is the former's capacity to progress, to access, with time and maturation, European adult subjectivity and to participate in European initiatives and projects. Implicit in Rousseau's philosophical maneuver is a restructuring and redistribution of global temporality, a deployment of distinct temporalities coded culturally and geographically.

In Time and the Other, Johannes Fabian documents a post-Enlightenment "secularization of Time" (11), which allows the secular conception of "natural history" to supersede Christian history and its providential teleology.[5] During the eighteenth century, time's secularization gives way in turn to its spatialization: "it is naturalized-spatialized Time which gives meaning . . . to the distribution of humanity in space" (25). The globe is now conceived as a composite of distinct temporal spaces. Europe

---

[5]This is not to say that the Christian view of history ceases to be culturally pertinent. Indeed, it would be difficult, in the absence of such a view, to fully account for Victorian belief in progress and in the civilizing, christianizing mission of colonialism. Fabian's point is that the secular time of "natural history" becomes the principal time in relation to which knowledge is gathered, organized, understood.

comes to represent history's "here and now," and distant "other places" become, in various ways and to varying degrees, its "there and then."

A new conception and practice of travel, Fabian finds, most clearly manifests the temporal distance marking the distinction between Europe and its others. Travel to distant places, to strange cultures "was to become (at least potentially) every man's source of "philosophical," secular knowledge. . . . [T]he idea and practice of travel as science . . . was definitively established toward the end of the eighteenth century" (6). Exemplifying the prevalent attitude of the late eighteenth-century intelligentsia, Fabian cites prominent "ideologue" J. M. Degérando, who asserts, "The philosophical traveller, sailing to the ends of the earth, is in fact travelling in time; he is exploring the past; every step he makes is the passage of an age" (7). Philosophical travel thus comes to be understood as time travel. What the traveller seeks and "finds" in non-European cultures are manifestations of various phases of Europe's past, relatively "primitive" social formations to be compared and contrasted with Europe's singular, exemplary modernity. In the figure of the cultural other, similarly, the philosophical traveller may confront and contemplate the image of a former self, a past self inhabiting a past time and place. As Fabian notes, "Primitive being essentially a temporal concept, is a category, not an object, of Western thought" (18). It is, moreover, a temporal concept that invokes the child, a category that comprehends the child and calls him into relation with the Other. As Montaigne's early essaying of New World questions already indicates, philosophical travellers (even those of the "armchair" variety) are disposed to discover in "primitive" cultural otherness the "childhood" of Europe.[6]

---

[6]Both Locke and Rousseau conclude their works on education by considering the role and value of travel. Both, moreover, are commenting upon and revaluating a widespread, established practice of persons of means. Émile's education culminates with travel to foreign lands, which takes him away from the already beloved Sophy, who must, of course, remain behind. Unlike Locke, who treats the question of educative

Fabian, in developing his argument, both acknowledges and contests the analogical linkage between the child and the primitive. Challenging the "taxonomic innocence" of the analogy—the position, as argued by Lévi-Strauss, that "All we do in calling primitives infantile is class perceived similarities"—Fabian asks,

> Are we to accept [Lévi Strauss's] contention that in our own society relations between adults and children merely reflect different degrees of "extension" of knowledge? Are we to overlook that adult-child relations are also, and sometimes primarily, fraught with barely disguised attitudes of power and practices of repression and abuse? Even worse, are we to forget that talk about the childlike nature of the primitive has never been just a neutral classificatory act, but a powerful rhetorical figure and motive, informing colonial practice in every aspect from religious indoctrination to labor laws and the granting of basic political rights? . . . Moreover, what could be clearer evidence of temporal distancing than placing the Now of the primitive in the Then of the Western adult? (63)

These rhetorical questions clearly suggest that the studious and insistent infantilization of the primitive enacts and legitimizes a practice of domination. The question, then, is not so much "How is the primitive to be perceived and understood?" but rather "How is the primitive to be managed, controlled, ruled?". The former concern is in the service of the latter. Within an epistemological economy that comprehends "difference as distance" (Fabian 16), as distance in space and time, the "primitive" Other is made to occupy an "other time"—a cultural past, a sort of temps révolu, already known, already ordered, a time over which the European adult has already established his

---

travel with considerable circumspection (184-187), Rousseau, despite a few reservations of his own, sees it as indispensable. Émile, however, will travel not for pleasure but for knowledge; he must learn "to travel as a philosopher." In Rousseau's view, "The child observes things till he is old enough to study men. Man should begin by studying his fellows . . ." (418). And "any one who has only seen one nation," he states categorically, "does not know men" (415). Although Émile does not pass beyond the bounds of Europe, his journeys initiate him to a knowledge-gathering practice that will, ultimately, embrace the world as the field of its endeavors.

(putative) dominion. By situating the cultural Other the more clearly and securely within a distant and different time, the figure of the child enables European discourses of domination, facilitating the psychic and symbolic management of cross-cultural encounter.

Fabian objects to the politics of the construct "childlike primitive," points up the lack of intellectual rigor in its deployment, yet leaves its fundamental logic unexamined. "The reasoning," he states,

> is as follows: We do have a valid point after all when we observe that the primitives appear to think like (our) children. Calling the primitive childlike is to "generalize" him as someone with whom we share a common transcultural basis. Analogies between socialization into a culture and learning a language supposedly demonstrate this. (62)

Fabian questions the validity of such premises—specifically, their capacity to function as cornerstones in the elaboration of a theory of culture. He does not debate with the implicit, apparently a priori assumption that the "child" can function, within such reasoning, as a stable term. The implicit, foundational logic—we can understand primitive strangeness in terms of the familiar child—needs, however, to be interrogated. The "child" is also a conceptual construct engendered and "othered" by a action of "temporal distancing," by the epistemological and discursive technique Fabian calls "allochronism" or "the denial of coevalness" (33). Neither the child, when considered as primitive, nor the cultural other, when considered as childlike, is allowed to occupy the same temporal frame as the civilized and enlightened European adult. The child, like the primitive, lives a different time. And, if this is so, can the "child" be so securely situated and deployed within the sphere of Western power and knowledge?

Fabian's analysis fails to take account of the possibility of a "return of the repressed" operating within emerging discourses of culture and cultural difference.

Considering the disruptive effects occasioned by the experience of such a "return," Freud posits "the uncanny" (das Unheimliche) as "something repressed which recurs," affirming that "this uncanny is in reality nothing new or alien but something which is familiar and old-established in the mind and which has become alienated from it only through a process of repression" (634). As Jack Zipes has said, commenting upon Freud, "the uncanny or unfamiliar (unheimlich) brings us in closer touch with the familiar (heimlich) because it touches on emotional disturbances and returns us to repressed phases in our evolution" (173). Now, if one reconceives the association of the figures of the child and the primitive in terms of the Freudian economy of the heimlich and the unheimlich, it becomes clear that if the "child" may serve to familiarize the "primitive," then the "primitive" may serve equally well to de-familiarize the "child."

During the formative period of Western modernity, Europe is encountering and attempting to dominate its cultural others, and it is also scrutinizing and striving to domesticate its children. In both cases, one must speak of process and struggle rather than of fait accompli. Elias points out that the European modern state is both externally embattled and internally pacified. Yet, as he emphasizes, internal pacification, which is crucial to the definition and expansion of the state's hegemonic frontiers, is never to be understood as entire and complete. Deeply implicated in the negotiation of internal pacification is the figure of the child, as my earlier discussion has shown. The child is not always-already a specified "subject" of early modern, European societies. On the contrary, the child represents a subject-in-process, a focal concern of social projects of civilization and subjection. To establish an economy of association and substitution, of metonymy and metaphor, between the (heimlich) child and the (unheimlich) "primitive" cultural other is, in fact, to bring one unmastered, one un- or under-subjected element into confrontation with another. Similarly perturbatory in its discursive effects is the tendency to associate childhood, and notably adolescence,

with the spaces and contexts of cultural alterity. The association of the child with the cultural other may serve to compound rather than to simplify the epistemological complexities attending both imperial expansion and internal pacification—two distinct, yet henceforth intimately interlinked projects of domination.[7]

What needs to be stressed, then, is the tenuousness of the analogical relation, a relation that is renegotiated and reworked in and by each instance of its application. As Fabian stresses, the "childlike native" is an ideological and discursive construct replete with socio-political implications. The same must be said of that "little heathen," the child. One must recognize, however, that the modern discourse of the child, as exemplified by Rousseau, does not produce an absolute equivalence between the child and the "primitive" cultural other. The child's relation with the other is envisioned and articulated as one of compelling similarity and significant difference. It is therefore noteworthy that Rousseau's Émile is made to develop beyond the state of noble savagery in which he first gains awareness of himself and his world, to progress toward a prescribed state of European adulthood. As I pointed out earlier, Rousseau in no way relaxes the demands for the painstaking practice of observation and discipline by which the civilizing process seeks to remake the child in the image of the adult. The developing child thus stands between the European adult and the "primitive" cultural other. The "child" is a bi-focal figure, a little Janus who looks in two different directions, backward to what he has been (and, to a certain degree, still is) and forward to what he will become. Considering Fabian's critical intervention, one can say, more precisely, that the figure of the child represents a gap of uncertainty between two distinct temporalities, between the time of the European subject and the time of the

---

[7]I must stress this theme of interlinkage. I do not intend to present either the "child" or the "primitive" as the origin or first cause in terms of which the other is to be understood. My point is that the "child" and the "primitive" emerge, each in conjunction with the other, during the same historical period and within the shared context of specific socio-cultural developments.

other. Three interdependent figures—the child, the "primitive" other, and the European adult—are thus brought into play, with the "child" sustaining a precarious balance between the other two. The figure of the child renders the encounter of Europe with its others meaningful in Eurocentric terms: both the child and the other are apprehended in subordinate relation to the privileged and defining case of European adulthood. Yet, by the mediation of the figure of the child the European subject is implicated, brought into psychic and symbolic relation with the cultural otherness.

To repatriate, at this point, the figure of the boy, to resituate him within the specifically British socio-cultural context of the later eighteenth century, provides the possibility of discovering all the more clearly and plainly the figure's intimate involvement with projects of imperial expansion. This recontextualization can also serve to confirm, on the one hand, the generalized currency and resonance of the "boy" and, on the other hand, the unstable, unsettling potentialities the figure's deployment may entail.

In The Rhetoric of English India, Sara Suleri has located noteworthy inscriptions of the "boy" as an organizing figure in Edmund Burke's late eighteenth-century articulation of an imperial crisis of conscience. Burke, unlike Rousseau, is concerned with India, not with the New World, and clearly recognizes that Indian culture cannot be assembled and ordered under the aegis of the "primitive." When brought into confrontation with India, Burke's "boy" asserts his potential for strangeness, manifesting an estrangement of the British imperial project from itself, from its own actions and ideals, and also from the Other it seeks to dominate. Burke's discourse introduces the "boy" to India, the crucial cultural referent of Kipling's later narratives of imperial adolescence, but deploys the figure to register disruption, to question rather than to affirm the British imperial enterprise.

Addressing the British House of Commons in 1783, Burke denounces the abuses and failures of the East India Company, interrogating, more generally, the Company's adequacy as the governing body of a vast, culturally complex Eastern empire: "All this vast mass, composed of so many orders and classes of men," Burke argues,

> is again infinitely diversified by manners, by religion, by hereditary employment, through all their possible combinations. This renders the handling of India a matter in a high degree critical and delicate. But, oh, it has been handled very rudely indeed! (qtd. in Suleri 27)

Burke goes on to "map" the object of his concern, both geographically and culturally, in great detail and at great length (see Suleri 26-30), but recalls repeatedly and emphatically that India, for the metropolitan observer, is "a very remote object [seen] through a very false and cloudy medium" (qtd. in Suleri 27).[8] As Suleri shrewdly perceives, in Burke's discourse "India breaks each attempt to put it to an inventory" (26), becoming finally "a catalog of the uncategorizable" (28). Burke's heady invocation of India's vastness and diversity places the object of contemplation beyond the ken of both reason and imagination, refashioning Indian history and actuality as "a monument to astonish the imagination, to confound the reason of mankind" (qtd. in Suleri 32) and raising to a bedeviling degree of complexity all questions of just and

---

[8]As will shortly be revealed, Burke goes on to picture British imperialists in India as irresponsible "boys" whose efforts and actions cannot begin to do justice to the sublimity of the India they govern. Curiously, however, Burke's rhetoric, as he begins, in the early stages of his argument, to invoke the Indian sublime, implicitly introduces the figure of the child: like Paul's child, whose predicament it is to see the world "through a glass darkly," Burke's metropolitan observer sees India "through a very false and cloudy medium." This implicit yet unmistakable Biblical allusion would seem to suggest that the ascription of childishness is not to be limited to the "boys" of the imperial vanguard. Observers at home must also be rendered as childish when placed in confrontation with the Indian sublime. A nagging sense of Britain's "youthful" inadequacy seems, in a quite general way, to worry and disturb Burke's meditations upon British-Indian relations.

appropriate colonial rule; submitted to the analysis of the most distinguished eighteenth-century theoretician of the sublime, India emerges, in Suleri's words, as "the age's leading moral example of the sublime" (28).

Having established the sublime multifariousness of the Indian empire, Burke proceeds with a more frontal attack upon Company administration, organizing his rhetoric around a startling figure:

> Young men (boys almost) govern there, without society and without sympathy with the natives. . . . Animated with all the avarice of age and all the impetuosity of youth, they roll in one after another, wave after wave . . . an endless, hopeless prospect of new flights of birds of prey and passage . . . .

His examination of the history of the acquisition of the Indian colonies leaves Burke

> stupefied by the desperate boldness of a few obscure young men, who, having obtained, by ways which they could not comprehend, a power of which they saw neither the purposes nor the limits, tossed about, subverted, and tore to pieces, as if it were in the gambols of a boyish unluckiness and malice, the most established rights, and the most ancient and revered institutions, of ages and nations. (qtd. in Suleri 32)

In his effort to stage and denounce the inadequacy and irresponsibility of the British colonizer faced with an extremity of colonial complexities, Burke strikes upon the figure of the boy.

What Burke requires, to give a more precise name to the topic of his concern, is a discourse of adolescence. His rhetoric vacillates back and forth between the "young man" and the "boy," unable to settle upon the figure Burke needs, which is the "boy" as adolescent, the precariously indeterminate "boy" who is more than a male "child" but still something less than a "man." The problem, of course, is that a discourse of adolescence is not available yet; as C. John Sommerville notes, it is only during the

course of the nineteenth century that childhood is "extended into something called adolescence" (179), an intermediate time of trouble and uncertainty closely associated with "stress," "delinquency," and "anti-social behavior" (Sommerville 198-208).[9] Burke's speech nonetheless evokes the character of fractious adolescence with fair exactitude: imperial Britain's representatives in the East are abundantly energetic yet irresponsibly impetuous, lacking in self-knowledge, unreflectingly driven by passion and appetite; comprehending neither "the purposes nor the limits" of their increasing stature and strength, the Company youths isolate themselves ("without society . . . without sympathy") and set themselves disruptively at odds with their social environment ("toss[ing] about, subvert[ing] and [tearing] to pieces" the social forms that would seek to restrain them). As Suleri maintains, one of Burke's "most significant recognitions . . . concerns the adolescence of the colonizing mind, when once the ungovernability of its youth is unleashed as a power on alien territory" (32).

Suleri duly notes the importance of the locus of Burke's discourse, which has as its setting the crucible of British legal and governmental power. Once presented in the House of Commons, Burke's "figures of speech" may be said to enjoy a kind of "spontaneous legitimation" (Suleri 28). And after Burke, Suleri observes, "The youthfulness of colonialism, its availability to the mythmaking of adolescent adventure, remains a central figure in the rhetoric of English India" (32). She duly notes, however, that Burke's dismayed denunciation differs sharply, in content and in tone, from the representations of adolescent imperialism and imperial adolescence that will follow upon it:

---

[9]The discourse of adolescence, as Sommerville points out, is (like the discourse of childhood) focused upon boys. Girls are considered less likely to "exhibit the stress that was now [in the later nineteenth and early twentieth century] associated with adolescence" (204). Adolescence comes to be construed as a "disease" that plagues masculine development most particularly. It was thought that "Girls were not so commonly afflicted as boys and had milder attacks" (205).

> When Burke indicts the colonial project as "the desperate boldness of a few obscure young men," he dismantles, a century before its time, the prevailing colonial stereotype of Anglo-Indian narrative, in which a tale-questing and abundant British imagination traverses the ancient and reprehensible lassitude of the Indian subcontinent. The adolescence which registers with Burke as an ethical and epistemological vacuity will be recuperated in the era of the Raj as a source of national pride and self-congratulation. (33)

Unlike Rousseau, who perceives the relation between the boyhood and the space and subjectivity of the cultural Other as one of natural similarity and affinity, Burke responds with dismay and astonishment to the "boy"-imperialist's intervention in India. The British "boy"-imperialist, far from being "right at home" in India, is entirely and reprehensibly out of place. Yet, while Burke ignores or rejects the child-native analogy in his analysis of cross-cultural, imperial relations, his intervention nonetheless implicates British imperial subjectivity in themes of adolescence. He also establishes the imperial "boy" as a core concern of the British imperial mission and, more particularly, of the imperial mission in India, the colony that will be of salient importance in Kipling's fictions. Burke contributes significantly to the formation of the "empire boy," but leaves the figure much in need of moral recuperation. Burke's discourse is indeed proleptic, as Suleri suggests, in that it critiques an imperial figure that is not yet fully formed, a figure, moreover, that will be formed, in part, in response to Burke and by the mediation of his critique.

For Suleri, James Mill and Thomas Babington Macaulay, Burke's "highly influential intellectual successors," are among the first to significantly reshape their eminent predecessor's anxious envisioning of British-Indian colonial encounter. Mill and Macaulay prepare the ground for the moral regeneration of Burke's infamous "boys" by replacing the earlier thinker's discourse of sublime complexity with a defamatory discourse of the archaic. Whereas Burke's India had presented "an abundance of history and tradition too difficult to catalog," Mill, in his History of India

(1817), displays and deplores "the subcontinent's perpetual arrest in prehistory" (Suleri 33). Whereas Burke had evoked a cultural complexity that defied reasoned apprehension, Macaulay, to further the Anglicizing project proposed in his "Minute on Indian Education" (1835), asserts, in Suleri's words, "the fundamental 'irrationality' of all the productions of Indian culture" (34). Summarizing the underlying logic of Macaulay's thinking, Suleri finds that he first considers India as "too old to be rational" and ultimately assumes a more extreme (and more irrational) position—"India is old, and to be old is evil" (34). Thus, "a static and mistrustful interpretation of India as a locus of all things ancient" indirectly enables an envisioning of British intervention in terms of enterprising and potentially regenerative "novelty" (Suleri 33). Without addressing themselves to questions of "adolescent" imperialism, both Mill and Macaulay, by inaugurating an assessment of Indian culture as "malevolent entropy" (Suleri 34), help to create the possibility of an imperial discourse that represents its "youthfulness," not as malignantly absurd, but rather as salutary. Between them, these two thinkers introduce a new time to the representation of non-European cultures. India's time does not coincide with that of its European colonizers, but nor is it the childlike time of the primitive. Indian culture is archaic—prehistoric, atavistic, beyond the grasp yet also beneath the dignity of reasoned analysis. Following the mid-century Mutiny, India's reprehensible agedness will provide the contrasting backdrop against which British imperialism's idealized youth will assert itself as vigorous, invigorating, and essentially if not purely virtuous.

Notwithstanding the importance of Mill's and Macaulay's contribution, Burke's representation of the delinquent adolescence of the imperial venture is susceptible to recuperative reconfiguration in large part because it flies in the face of a new cultural trend C. John Sommerville characterizes as "the glorification of the child" (120 ff.), which begins to manifest itself in the eighteenth century and is consolidated, in large part, by nineteenth-century literatures of the child. Certainly, to speak of a specifically

imperial ideal of childhood and, more particularly, of boyhood requires one to focus upon popular fiction. Suleri, in the course of her discussion, briefly acknowledges the special importance of "the popular fiction of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century" in the cultural process that reworks the seminal contribution of Burke and, at the same time, brings the thinking of Mill and Macaulay to its fullest fruition (32). Without doubt, the rehearsing of the paradigms of British imperialism's glorious "youthfulness" occurs most obviously and insistently in the arena that will come to be known as the "boy's book."

Jeffrey Richards, in his "Introduction" to Imperialism and Juvenile Literature, locates in the latter half of the nineteenth century, "the creation of a genre—the boy's adventure tale" (3). Yet even before the midcentury, this new genre begins to take shape. "Marryat," writes Richards, "observing how his adult novel Mr. Midshipman Easy (1836) had obtained wide popularity with boys, turned his energies to writing books specifically for boys, notably Masterman Ready (1841) and The Children of the New Forest (1847)" (3). (Masterman Ready is especially noteworthy in that, following the example of Rousseau, it reworks the Crusoe narrative as a vehicle for boys' instruction.) Captain Marryat's seafaring, frequently militaristic fictions, with their diverse, far-flung settings, help to set the standard for a host of popular and prolific writers of imperial adventures for boys, including W. H. G. Kingston and R. M. Ballantyne (who produced between them nearly 300 novel-length adventures for boys [Richards 4]), W. Gordon Stables, G. A. Henty, and Mayne Reid. The list of the more distinguished if less prolific, influential and widely read practitioners of the imperial adventure tale in the period after 1850 would include Charles Kingsley, H. Rider Haggard, R. L. Stevenson, and of course Rudyard Kipling, all of whom may be credited with producing "classics" of the genre. Typically entailing cross-cultural encounter (generally of a violent nature) in India, Africa, the Americas, and in the

Pacific Rim, the adventure tales consolidate the imaginative linkage between youthful, enterprising masculinity and the contact zones of empire.[10]

Also in the second half of the nineteenth century, another important juvenile literary genre appears—the school story for boys. In 1857, Thomas Hughes publishes Tom Brown's Schooldays, a tremendously successful, much imitated work that locates in the English public school a principal setting for the ethical and psychological training of future administrators of the Empire. Significantly, Hughes sets his story in England, at Rugby, yet proudly names his fiction's larger context as "our British Empire." Hughes sets in motion a recoding of the school in imperial terms. As Joseph Bristow puts the case, "the mid-1850s established the beginning of a new type of public-school ideology, one connected with war, honour, and, above all, doing well on the playing field" (57). For Hughes and for the school-tale writers who follow his lead (the most notable among these being the popular and very productive Talbot Baines Reed), the school is an imperial training ground: rugby matches are battles, where honor is won or lost; cricket matches provide training in ésprit de corps.

In "A New Grub Street for Boys," Patrick Dunae observes that "The last quarter of the nineteenth century witnessed a dramatic growth in popular literature for boys" and discovers in this burgeoning body of literature "a potent agent in promoting imperial enthusiasms" (13). Accounting for this specific transformation of the literary marketplace, he emphasizes three key factors: "the Victorian discovery of adolescence, technological advances, and educational reforms" (13). The Victorians,

---

[10]Adventure writers of the last decades of the nineteenth century become, moreover, increasingly self-aware with respect to the imperial implications of their work and increasingly sensitive to the topical enthusiasms bred by the imperial venture. Henty's career is in this respect illustrative: abandoning the "classical" adventures set in ancient Greece or Rome, which had dominated his unsuccessful early career, Henty, to great acclaim, "modernizes" his contents and goes on to become the most popular fictional chronicler of modern imperial exploits (see Bristow 146-47).

Dunae argues, sharpen the distinction between the girl and the boy, between the "child" and the "juvenile" (or adolescent). "From about the 1860s," he writes, "literature was produced specifically for adolescent readers. About the same time, the literature also became sex-segregated" (14). And, as he stresses, boys' literature quickly establishes itself as "the most important sector of the youth publishing industry" (14). On the topic of technological innovations, Dunae draws particular attention to the development, also in the 1860s, of the Hoe cylinder press, which "dramatically increased the speed of printing and paved the way for mass circulation periodicals" (14). He similarly emphasizes the importance of the Forster's Education act of 1870, which, within ten years, "created over one million new places in the schools of Britain" (14). The expectation of "a vast new market" of youthful readers "prompted the [publishing] industry to focus on the youth market for the first time" (14-15). Along with the boy's book, another relatively new cultural phenomenon, the boy's magazine, becomes an increasingly unignorable presence in the British cultural scene. The new initiatives in the publishing industry reflect, moreover, the popular fervors that signal the advent of the "New Imperialism." Advocacy of Britain's imperial mission is ever more frankly stated in the pages of the new magazines, where school and adventure tales, along with geographical and historical accounts of the growing empire, figure prominently.

Evaluating the various pertinent developments in late nineteenth-century British culture, Bristow writes, "Imperialism made the boy into an aggrandized subject . . . with the future of the world lying upon his shoulders" (19). Called upon to identify with his nation's imperial prestige,

> the boy was idealizing a quality he himself enshrined. Empire and boyhood . . . were mutually supportive. Everywhere the nation's young hero encountered texts and illustrations that made him the subject of his reading. Here the boy was both the reader and the focus of what he read. (41)

British popular culture thus manifests, as Bristow, Richards, and Dunae all emphasize, an unprecedented capacity to shape young minds and to inspire in them appropriately imperial values and aspirations. Yet the cultural scenario Bristow describes has implications that extend beyond the circumscribed space of boyhood to the national culture as a whole. During the period in question, the imperial boy clearly emerges as a key figure preoccupying, and giving expression to, a national consciousness, a British sense of self, a shared, national envisioning of imperial aspiration and destiny. The youthful heroes of the new adventure literature, although commonly young men, are frequently adolescents—adolescent heroes such as Ralph Rover, Jack Martin, and Peterkin Gay of Ballantyne's The Coral Island, Dick Humphries and Tom Jackson of Henty's The Young Colonists. The principal characters of school fictions are invariably adolescents. These abundant representations of adolescent, empire-affirming boyhood command the attention not only of boys, but of publishers, writers, critics, parents, teachers—briefly, the vast segment of the adult population that produces or distributes, praises, condones, or perhaps deplores these same representations. The empire that so richly invests the "boy" also implicates itself in the figure it creates.

Richards, Dunae, and Bristow characterize the boy's magazine as a fiercely contested discursive space. Probably the single most significant event in British culture's battle for the boy is the appearance in 1879 of "one of the most influential and long-lived boys' magazines, The Boy's Own Paper, in which the empire was promoted as the ideal vehicle for the spread of Christian civilization" (Richards 5). Published by the Religious Tract Society, BOP's explicitly stated agenda is to counter the supposedly nefarious influence of the enormously popular "penny dreadfuls" or "bloods," which Dunae characterizes as "cheap, rumbustious publications that featured the quixotic exploits of highwaymen, pirates, and boy brigands" (22). Drawing upon its substantial financial resources, the BOP employed the talents of such as Henty, Reed, Stables, and Kingston to produce venturesome imperial heroes who might displace in the minds of

the nation's youth the likes of "Tom Wildrake" (whose name speaks eloquently the character of its bearer) and "Jack Harkaway," a self-serving, devil-may-care delinquent Dunae describes as "the very antithesis of Tom Brown" (25).

As Dunae's antithetical opposition begins to suggest, debate over boys' literature generally and over the "dreadfuls" in particular is significantly inflected by questions of class. Tom Brown, the prototype of the school hero, is of the English gentry. Similarly, the vast majority of adventure heroes manifesting the youthful form of robust, gamely "Christian manliness" have their provenance in the middle or upper classes. "Dreadful" heroes, despite their frequent usurpation of the forms of the rogue aristocrat, are generally charismatic youths of undistinguished or unspecified class origins who, having chosen adventurous criminality over dutiful laboriousness, gaily, gallantly flout the law and gracefully elude the incompetent pursuit of its representatives. As Bristow notes, the "dreadfuls" generally target "a working-class readership" with which they enjoy an "enduring popularity" (31). And it is their influence upon the laboring classes that their critics fear and denounce (12-17). The principal rival publication, the BOP, proposes to remain "sound and healthy in tone" (qtd. in Bristow 39), advocates patriotism and duty, and provides both "useful knowledge" and stimulating yet right-minded entertainment. Although the success of its bid for boy readers is indisputable, it is by no means entire. The "dreadfuls" continue to haunt boy's literature: first, by their unabated popularity and salient presence in the marketplace; secondly, and perhaps more crucially, by their unacknowledged yet seemingly unavoidable influence upon the saner and sager publications that arise in reaction against them. Boy's Own Paper or Boys of England, for all that their material is informed by "key middle-class values" (Bristow 33), cannot do without fictions of action and adventure similar to those offered by their predecessors and competitors, the "dreadfuls." Stating the case more baldly, Bristow writes, "Violence had to be taken away from the recently named hooligan and restyled

for the respectable boy" (47). This "respectable boy," however, reveals a certain affiliation with the "blood" hero: although he is patriotic and responds to duty's call, the BOP boy is, in Bristow's words, "aggressive, competitive, and yet gentlemanly" (41), an early representative of "a new kind of militaristic masculinity" energized by "a distinctive imperial spirit" (47). Despite the necessity of marking and maintaining its class divisions, an aggressively expansive, imperial nation clearly must demand something other than "sweetness and light" from its youth. Summarizing the curious progress of British popular culture in "Penny Dreadfuls: Late Nineteenth-Century Boys' Literature and Crime," Dunae observes that the literature that "one generation of critics had denounced as 'blood and thunder' came, in a slightly altered form, to be regarded by the next generation as wholesome and patriotic" (150). The battle for the boy thus arrives, by the end of the nineteenth century, at its peculiar resolution: empire and the "empire boy" emerge as the victors in a discursive struggle organized around disparate forms of class consciousness.

The adolescent imperial protagonist, representing in Kipling's time an essential, abundantly deployed element of the British cultural patrimony, is yet a curiously overdetermined figure fraught with anxious aspirations, susceptible to a variety of incommensurate and incompatible representations. Indeed, what most distinguishes the new "boy" is the excessive burden of societal investments he must bear. Taking shape amidst class conflict and in the forge of emergent imperial meanings and values, the "boy" is a figure emblazoned with the moral ideals of his society's dominant classes, but one who may also appear in guise of the delinquent or the renegade; a potential representative of imperialism's noble mission of disinterested Christian service, yet a manifestation of a newer, aggressive and opportunistic imperial mood. Even the ideal "boy," as outlined in the pages of "respectable" boys' popular literature in the last decades of the nineteenth century, resembles not only the "blood" protagonist, but, still more closely, the "boy"-imperialist Burke had denounced a century before.

Certainly, the new "boy," unlike Burke's, has been made to understand something of his imperial responsibilities. Indeed, in Bristow's view, popular discourses of the boy conspire to make imperial Britain's "new generation of young men feel that they [are] the central social actors of their day" (48). What has occurred is a reorganization and rearticulation, in close relation with the demands of energetic imperial expansion, of the pre-existing myths and ideals of childhood that assign the child a place and role within the social dynamic. Established in this process as the key figure is the adolescent boy, a principal site of socio-cultural aspirations and anxieties, in whom the double wager of social evolution at home and the imperial mission abroad is played out.

This imperial boy, moreover, must be understood to possess a resonance extending beyond the literary, fictional realm that constitutes the principal site of his formation. As influential sociologist G. Stanley Hall, in his two-volume Adolescence of 1904, puts the case,

> The child from nine to twelve is well adjusted to his environment and proportionately developed; he represents probably an old and relatively perfected stage of race-maturity, still in some sense and degree feasible in warm climates, which . . . stands for a long continued one, a terminal stage of human development at some post-simian point. At dawning adolescence this old unity and harmony with nature is broken up; the child is driven from his paradise and must enter upon a long viaticum of ascent, must conquer a higher kingdom of man for himself, break out a new sphere and evolve a more modern story to his psycho-physical nature. Because his environment is to be far more complex, the combinations are less stable, the ascent less easy and secure; there is more danger that the youth in his upward progress, under the influence of this "excelsior" motive, will backslide in one or several of the many ways possible. New dangers threaten on all sides. It is the most critical stage of life, because failure to mount almost always means retrogression, degeneracy, or fall. (qtd. in Sommerville 204)

Hall, evidently, is unable to discuss the general nature of adolescence without evoking heady themes of racial progress and conquest, or again, degeneration, loss of vitality

and power. R. S. S. Baden-Powell, writing at approximately the same historical moment, does not focus so sharply upon anxiety-ridden questions of adolescence. However, he clearly concurs with Hall in situating the adolescent boy, specifically the "scout," at the very centre of imperial questions:

> From this little island of Great Britain have sprung colonies all over the world, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Canada.
>
> Almost every race, every kind of man, black, white, or yellow, have furnished subjects of King Edward VII.
>
> This vast Empire did not grow of itself out of nothing; it was made by your forefathers by dint of hard work and hard fighting . . . . People say that we have no patriotism nowadays, and that our Empire will fall to pieces like the great Roman Empire did . . . . I am not so sure about that. I am sure that if you boys will keep the good of your country in your eyes above everything else she will go all right. But if you don't do this there is very great danger, because we have many enemies abroad . . . . (28-30).

Baden-Powell imagines the British island as a prodigiously generative dam, a mother country that gives birth to colonies. These colonies, as if born pregnant, dutifully "furnish" subjects for the British king. Responsibility for the "mother" country and her abundant progeny passes by natural succession from the hard-working, hard-fighting "forefathers" to the new generation of boys. The Empire is presented as the filial, familial duty that falls upon the duly designated heirs apparent.

Having sketched the genealogy of the figure of the boy up to Kipling's time, I have not yet accounted for a singularly important aspect of his deployment of the "boy": as I signalled in my "Introduction," the "empire boy" is the bearer of a gaze. My subsequent discussion of Kipling's narratives of imperial adolescence will repeatedly reveal that the "boy" is intensely and consistently involved in the organization and management of various spaces. One of Kipling's boy-protagonist's chief

responsibilities is, in other words, the production of dominated space. This production invariably entails visual mediation, the work of the active, discriminating eye.

Already in the work of Rousseau, the close association between knowledge acquisition and visual practice is stressed. "Teach your scholar to observe the phenomena of nature," advocates Rousseau (displaying his usual distrust of the knowledges of "the study"): "Let us transform our sensations into ideas . . . . Let the senses be the only guide for the first workings of reason" (131). Empirical learning is predominantly a matter of visual learning, a training of the eye and a training by the eye, which, disdaining the symbol, aims to establish between the learner and his objects of study a direct visual relation: "As a general rule—never substitute the symbol for the thing signified, unless it is impossible to show the thing itself" (133). The child will learn about the world by looking at it: "You wish to teach this child geography and you provide him with globes, spheres, and maps. What elaborate preparations! . . . [W]hy not begin by showing him the real thing so that he may at least know what you are talking about?" (131). Rousseau's distrust of the symbol, his choice of direct experience over representation, is unfortunately at odds not only with the conventional educational orientations of his time (which he self-consciously seeks to contest) but also with his own practice. Presenting his ideas in terms of a pedagogical fiction, Rousseau offers not an actual child but "Émile," not experience but its simulation; he cannot avoid representing both the boy and his educational experience. Not, then, Rousseau's distrust of representation (which is ultimately untenable) but his faith in vision must command attention most compellingly. It is this faith that links Rousseau's thinking with what Fabian describes as a modern "cultural, ideological bias toward vision as the 'noblest sense' and toward . . . graphic-spatial conceptualization as the most 'exact' way of communicating knowledge" (106).

"Visualism," Fabian argues, originates with the visual, architectonic techniques comprising the classical rhetorician's "art of memory" (109-13). It receives its

principal modern impetus from Pierre de la Ramée, the sixteenth-century philosopher and "theoretician of teaching of knowledge" who is instrumental in "transmitting some of the deepest convictions of [the classical rhetorical] tradition—those concerning visual images and spatial ordering—to the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century thinkers whom we recognize as immediate precursors of modern science." Ramist theory, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, gains wide acceptance and becomes virtually "synonymous with pedagogical method" (114). Fully compatible with the concerns and initiatives of "the Gutenberg era," Ramée's "thoroughly visualized, spatialized, and combinatory conception of knowledge" spurs the formation of new norms for the production and communication of knowledge (115). "Ramism and its belated incarnations," Fabian observes, "equate the knowable with that which can be visualized, and logic, the rules of knowledge, with orderly arrangements of pieces of knowledge in space" (116). Both the natural and the human sciences eventually inherit and are ordered by "syntheses of knowledge whose organizing metaphors, models, and schemes are thoroughly visual and spatial" (107).

Both the child and the cultural Other occupy a significant place within the visualist apparatus of Western knowledge systems. Fabian takes note of the established belief "that the visual-spatial is more germane to the infantile and adolescent mind than to mature intelligence." Closely associated with this key premise are the "seldom articulated but firm convictions that presentations of knowledge through visual and spatial images, maps, diagrams, trees, and tables are particularly well suited to the description of primitive cultures" (121). A preferred methodological orientation associates pedagogy with ethnology. Visualism thus reveals its noteworthy political and ideological implications: "The hegemony of the visual as a mode of knowing may . . . directly be linked to the political hegemony of an age group, a class, or one society over another. The ruler's subject and the scientist's object have, in the case of anthropology (but also of sociology and psychology), an intertwined history" (122).

Fabian's analysis of visualism is of particular pertinence in the analysis of key technological and cultural developments of late nineteenth-century British imperial culture, which represents the actuality of its empire as prominently, abundantly, and energetically as it does the boyhood that embodies its hopes and aspirations. In Propaganda and Empire, John M. MacKenzie documents what may be described as the popularization, in imperial terms, of the visualist bias, detailing the overwhelmingly visual and spectacular orientation of British cultural production in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. "There seems to have been," MacKenzie suggests, "a craving for visual representations of the world, of events, and of the great and famous, which a large number of agencies and commercial companies sought to satisfy in the period from the 1870s to tne First World War." Considering the most obviously commercial aspects first, MacKenzie notes the development of new, visual and pictorial "advertising techniques," emphasizing that "companies creating and supplying the new tastes were concerned to sell not just their own product, but also the world system which produced it." The empire comes to figure largely in the British consumer's eye, in part because "[t]he most aggressive and innovative advertisers of the day [are] companies dependent on the imperial economic nexus, in tea, chocolate, soaps and oils, tobacco, meat extracts, shipping, and later rubber." Such companies strive to associate their products with "a romantic view of imperial origins" and "a pride in national possession of what Joseph Chamberlain called the 'imperial estates'" (16). Tea, biscuit, chocolate, and tobacco tins, glossy enamel signs, posters, and (most notably) cigarette cards are among the advertising elements that make quotidian encounters with imagery of empire almost inevitable.

During this period the visualization of empire enters fully into the British domestic scene, becoming a familiar aspect of the average Briton's everyday experience. The cigarette card, together with the picture postcard (another new arrival on the cultural scene) and the burgeoning number of colorfully illustrated boys' papers offer glimpses

of a real or imagined empire and succeed in rousing a "craze for collecting" (MacKenzie 17). Also noteworthy amidst the vast array of cheap, widely available, collectible items are stereoscope cards depicting "other places, other climes" (20); "commemorative plates, mugs, and cups" of jubilees and other significant national and imperial events (27); board games and jigsaws that display, visually and spatially, the period's "military and imperial preoccupations" (28); toy soldiers "representing all British, Indian, and colonial regiments, as well as allies, enemies, and 'ethnic' fighters" (28); almanacks, manuals, and yearbooks "full of the standard images" of an "age of empire" (29). Taken together, these various elements constitute a visual and imperial propaganda of everyday life.

MacKenzie stresses the central importance of the postcard in the process he describes as "the democratization of the visual image" (21). Upon the development of the inexpensive, fully portable Eastman Kodak camera in 1888 and of rapid, low-cost photographic printing techniques in the 1890s, the ubiquitous postcard emerges to assert the potentialities of the camera as an instrument of global domination: "Through photography Europe could provide itself with a visual representation of the remodelling of the world through economic and political control" (MacKenzie 19). "Sales of cards," MacKenzie notes, "were not limited to the areas they represented . . . . Shops maintained a full range, and people collected them just like stamps." And, as he emphasizes,

> Vast numbers of cards were produced of the Empire itself, recording new buildings, transport and engineering achievements, colonial products, visits of governors and royalty, colonial forces and frontier warfare, labour migration, "ethnics" showing the whole range of indigenous peoples under imperial rule, pioneering farmers, prospectors and miners, together with romantic (and sometimes fictional) deeds of imperial heroism. (23)

Offering "images which heightened the actions of the age, pictures that encapsulated the world," the postcard provides, in its time, "the supreme expression of control through a particular type of slanted visual understanding" (21).

The visual representation of empire is not, of course, restricted to its manifestations in the small scale of "private life." Its presence within the public sphere is, if anything, even more obstreperously evident. "Magic lantern" slide shows, offered by explorers and missionary travellers, fill church halls, auditoriums and theatres. Entertainments in the working men's clubs and in the increasingly popular music halls stir patriotic, jingoist and imperialist enthusiasms. In the theatres, popular melodramas, drawing their material from current and historic events, offer spectacular depictions of imperial scenes in vivid, meticulously detailed panorama. The tributes, ceremonies, pageants, and processions of the Victorian jubilees of 1887 and 1897 give pomp and circumstance to the imperial idea, literally parading it before the public eye. (The 1887 jubilee is appropriately memorialized with the foundation, by the Queen, of the Imperial Institute.) The massively attended great exhibitions—almost annual events in the years around the turn of the century—offer visual display on a truly grand scale. As reflected in their naming—the Colonial and Indian (1886), the Empire of India (1895), the Greater Britain (1899)—the exhibitions, from the 1880s forward, "[come] to be dominated by the imperial theme" (MacKenzie 97).

The significance of the jubilees and exhibitions deserves to be stressed, in so far as these spectacular public events manage to bring the reality of empire together with its representation. Visible in high profile are the innumerable dignitaries, representatives, and officers assembled for the jubilees. Visible, too, are the processions of troops from every corner of the empire and the unprecedented throngs of bedazzled spectators. London, the symbolic centre of the empire, becomes during the jubilees the site of an imperial assembly, where society and spectacle come together in a singular

manifestation, the site (and the sight) of the empire's material and historical actuality, its irrefutable here-and-now.

If not in matters of emotion, at least in terms of their scope, their diversity and variety, and, most significantly, in their capacity to present as well as represent the imperial reality, the exhibitions, by the turn of the century, come to rival the jubilees, combining "entertainment, education,and trade fair on a spectacular scale," becoming

> enormous funfairs, coupled with, in effect, museums of science, industry, and natural history, anthropological and folk displays, emigration bureaux, musical festivals, and art galleries, together with examples of transport and media innovations, all on one large site. (MacKenzie 97)

In the exhibition context, the materials, objects, products, technologies, and, ultimately, the subjects of the empire discover themselves in and as spectacle, becoming, effectively, the image of themselves. One sees "the raw materials, the manufactures created from them, . . . the arts that [decorate] the manufactures" (98) and, as much as possible, the instruments and technologies, indeed, the actual processes of production. The drive to achieve the "reality effect" (by reproducing the imperial real in the form of spectacular simulacra) reaches a high point at the Greater Britain Exhibition of 1899, which features, for the first time, live animals wandering about in simulated habitats, busy "native villages" peopled by living subjects engaged in a wide variety of "everyday activities," and, perhaps most notably, re-enactments of contemporary imperial victories in which the recently conquered are recruited to perform the drama of their defeat. The subjects of empire become elements within a "visual living taxonomy" (MacKenzie 105) that enacts an imperial progress:

> Yesterday's enemies, the perpetrators of yesterday's 'barbarism', [become] today's exhibits, showing off quaint music, dancing, sports, living crafts, and food, but now set on the path to civilization. . . . [R]epresentatives of African

> and oriental peoples [are] brought cheek-by-jowl with all the trappings of the world-wide economy. (MacKenzie 114)

MacKenzie's scholarship, especially when considered in the light of Fabian's, demonstrates that, despite its vastness, complexity, and diversity, the British empire is presented to British subjects as visually appropriable. Through visual cultural mediation the empire becomes a matter of public and also private interest, a national yet also a personal possession. British subjects, even those who never venture beyond the bounds of little England, can thus be made to understand and appreciate their status as imperial subjects, a status that is confirmed and sustained not only by the grand spectacle of frequent, fully public manifestations, but also by a multiplicity of everyday experiences. Through the abundance and ubiquity of its representation, "the Empire" effectively becomes the Other in relation to which British subjectivity shapes and constitutes itself.

Popular literature representing both boyhood and empire participates in the visualization of imperial actuality directly and indirectly. As MacKenzie notes, the books bear colorfully illustrated covers, as do the magazines. The magazines, invariably, and the books, very commonly, include illustrated pages. Moreover, this literature, even in its specifically literary aspects, conspires with the visual media to make the empire imaginatively accessible in predominantly visual terms. Kipling's work, for example, invites readers to pleasurably envision foregrounded boy characters, to identify with Mowgli, in the Indian jungle amongst his wolves, with Stalky, in maneuvers both at school and on the Indian frontier, and with Kim, jubilantly astride the Zam-Zammah gun or avidly observing the bustle of India's Grand Trunk Road. One sees and experiences the empire in tandem with the boy. The figure of the imperial boy (typically imaged on the cover of the publication that narrates his exploits) is offered as an emblematic protagonist orienting and mediating various

experiences of empire. Visual and literary representations combine to make the individual Briton's relationship with "the Empire" seem intimate, immediate, intensely meaningful. Enabling a detailed, particular, pleasurable and affirmative envisioning of the British empire is an important function of the "boy" and of the literature he inhabits.

Narratives of the imperial "boy" can serve, then, to articulate a discourse of domination. Fictions of the "empire boy" must be seen to participate in the ordering and constitution of the British subject's apprehension of the relationship between self and world, self and Other. The "boy" instigates and facilitates processes of identification binding that subject to the imperial project of the nation. The figure represents a significant contribution to what Satya P. Mohanty calls the British imperial "project of self-fashioning" ("Drawing" 328), the forging of an image of selfhood in relation to which imperial aspirations and values can be affirmatively enunciated. As Said, following Foucault, makes clear, both in Orientalism and in his more recent Culture and Imperialism, discourses of domination actualize power, especially when the power that is professed correlates with other established structures and practices of political, economic, and socio-cultural domination. Notwithstanding the power-productive materiality of discourse, its sense-making role must be stressed: representations of empire and the boy are, first and foremost, enabling fictions bearing the promise—perhaps the false promise—of a coherent relation between the British imperial subject and the history and actuality of British imperialism.

Given their imaginative richness and textual sophistication, examination of Kipling's "boy" narratives as enabling yet unsettling imperial fictions will require, I think, a reasonably complex application of critical theory of subject formation. In speaking of the "boy" as a figure, I propose him as a culturally generated site of investment and identification positioned within that larger configuration, "the Empire."

My analysis of structures of investment and identification in Kipling's narratives will evidence a Lacanian orientation, employing, most crucially, the concepts of the Imaginary and the Symbolic. Although both are fundamental to Jacques Lacan's psychoanalysis, neither concept, unfortunately, is submitted to sharp definition by the ever elusive French theorist, but must be deduced from an overall deployment in his oeuvre.

The notions of the Imaginary order and of Imaginary identification are introduced in "The mirror stage as formative of the function of the I as revealed in psychoanalytic experience" (Écrits). In this seminal text, Lacan locates the first formation of the ego—the psychic structure organizing and enabling the sense of self, of individual specificity—in terms of a specular economy of self-recognition: the preverbal infant discovers itself in a mirror-image, a reflection that offers a gratifying fiction of personal coherence; the child, more precisely, (mis)recognizes itself as an integrated whole in relation to the alluring, sharply delineated imago in the mirror. The mirror-enchanted child manifests his self-recognition through a process of "illuminative mimicry":

> This act [of recognition], far from exhausting itself . . . once the image has been mastered and found empty, immediately rebounds . . . in a series of gestures in which [the child] experiences in play the relation between the movements assumed in the image and the reflected environment, and between the virtual complex and the reality it reduplicates—the child's own body, and the persons and things, around him. (Lacan 1)

The mirror phase must therefore, Lacan asserts, be understood "as an identification, in the full sense that analysis gives to the term: namely, the transformation that takes place in the subject when he assumes an image"; it "exhibit[s] in an exemplary situation the symbolic matrix in which the I is precipitated in a primordial form, . . . before language restores to it, in the universal, its function as subject." (The child's

accession to language, the Symbolic order, completes the process of subject-formation, as will shortly be revealed.) Lacan emphasizes, however, that despite its foundational role in "the functions of libidinal normalization," Imaginary identification orders the subject's "reality" in relation with a fictional and alienated self-image,

> situat[ing] the agency of the ego, before its social determination, in a fictional direction, which will always remain irreducible for the individual alone, or rather, which will only rejoin the coming-into-being (le devenir) of the subject asymtotically, whatever the success of the dialectical syntheses by which he must resolve as I his discordance with his own reality.
>
> The fact is that the total form of the body by which the subject anticipates in a mirage the maturation of his power is given to him only as Gestalt, that is to say, in an exteriority in which this form is certainly more constituent than constituted . . . . [T]his Gestalt . . . symbolizes the mental permanence of the I, at the same time as it prefigures its alienating destination; it is still pregnant with the correspondences that unite the I with the statue in which man projects himself, with the phantoms that dominate him . . . . (2-3)

These dynamic and irresolvable tensions informing Imaginary identification make of it an enduring psychic and experiential orientation: the mirror image "whose veiled faces it is our privilege to see in outline in our daily experience . . . would seem to be the threshold of the visible world"; the "imago of one's own body," which frequently finds oneiric or imaginative expression in the figure of the "double," remains the structure in terms of which "the world of [man's] own making tends to find completion." Originally instituted through gestures of mimicry, the imago ultimately provides the basis for "heteromorphic identification" and intimately links itself to "the signification of space for the living organism" (3). It becomes "the function of the imago . . . to establish a relation between the organism and its reality—or, as they say, between the Innenwelt and the Umwelt" (4). By facilitating primordial acts of "spatial captation," the mirror phase lures the human animal into assuming "the armour of an alienating identity, which will mark with its rigid structure the subject's entire

development" and inscribe its peculiarity upon the entire "anatomy of phantasy" (4-5). Thus, in the mirror stage Lacan discovers the originary moment of Imaginary identification, which, even after the imperious and irresistible advent of the symbolic universe of the Word, will continue to order "the passionate desire peculiar to man to impress his image in reality" (22), the drive to create and recreate the world in meaningful relation with an illusory yet enticing alien—the Imaginary I.

Notwithstanding the enduring importance of the Imaginary and its identificatory modes in his theory, it is in the initiation to the Symbolic order of language that Lacan locates the definitive emergence of the fully human subject. Already in "The Mirror Stage" he looks forward to "the deflection of the specular I into the social I" (5), to the restructuring of the I in "socially elaborated situations" and its "normalization" through processes of "cultural mediation" (5-6). Noting the developmental contemporaneity of language apprehension and the Freudian Oedipus complex, Lacan intuits that language is the structuring apparatus that enables the family drama to constitute the child as a social being susceptible and responsive to social demands and constraints. The acquisition of speech, however, redoubles the self-alienation already evident in the mirror stage, obliging the child-subject to identify in the locus of the Other, to take place in relation to systems of meaning not his own.

In "The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis" (Écrits), the lecture in which the notion of the Symbolic first takes shape, Lacan asserts that, for the human subject, "It is the world of words that creates the world of things." Intersubjective symbolic exchange does not merely mediate but rather structures and defines the human reality: "Man speaks, . . . but it is because the symbol has made him man" (65); "The psychoanalytic experience has rediscovered in man the imperative of the Word as the law that has formed him in its image" (106). Employing the Saussurean distinction between langue (the system of language) and parole (the act of speech), Lacan emphasizes how thoroughly langue dominates and determines,

circumscribes and constrains each individual enactment of parole, thus portraying "man" not as an autonomous speaking being but as a subjected being constituted in and by social symbolic networks, regimented by the vast array of language systems whose imperatives precede and far exceed all merely individual initiatives:

> Symbols in fact envelop the life of man in a network so total that they join together, before he comes into the world, those who are going to engender him "by flesh and blood"; so total that they bring to his birth . . . the shape of his destiny; so total that they give the words that will make him faithful or renegade, the law of the acts that will follow him right to the very place where he is not yet and even beyond his death . . . . (68)

The Symbolic is thus the order in which the subject must discover and assume a place—one that is never a place of privilege. Lacan makes clear that the Symbolic is to be understood as a self-sustaining and self-referring system that confronts the individual speaking subject and recruits her or him to its service. As Alan Sheridan points out,

> the symbols referred to [in Lacanian theory] are not icons, stylized formations, but signifiers, in the sense developed by Saussure and Jakobson, extended into a generalized definition: differential elements, in themselves without meaning, which acquire value only in their mutual relations, and forming a closed order . . . . (Lacan ix).

Considering the agency of the signifier in subject formation, Lacan affirms first "that there is no signification that does not refer to another signification" (259) and subsequently, taking a more alarmingly subversive stance, that "a signifier is that which represents the subject for another signifier" (316). The subject, in its Symbolic dimension, is, in the last analysis, a relay, an intermediary, a locus of Symbolic negotiation and experimentation; put another way, the subject does not dispose of the signifier, does not self-represent by means of the signifier, but rather is represented by and for signifiers.

Although both constitute, for the subject, enduring orders of experience, the relationship between the Imaginary and the Symbolic is neither complementary nor readily commensurable. As Sheridan observes,

> According to Lacan, a distinction must be drawn between what belongs in experience to the order of the symbolic and what belongs to the imaginary. In particular, the relation between the subject, on the one hand, and the signifiers, speech, language, on the other, is frequently contrasted with the imaginary relation, that between the ego and its images. (ix)

The Imaginary and Symbolic must be understood as competing orders that orient and organize subjectivity in distinctly different ways. Both orders, moreover, are unavoidably at odds with the Real, which, in Lacanian theory, is "that before which the imaginary faltered, that over which the symbolic stumbles, that which is refractory, resistant" (x). A criticism oriented by Lacanian notions of the Imaginary and the Symbolic orders must therefore remain aware of the tensions with which the triad of the Imaginary, the Symbolic, and the Real are fraught.

As my subsequent chapters will manifest, Kipling's representation of the imperial "boy" draws richly upon the cultural heritage this chapter has outlined. Kipling's "boy" serves to specify and distribute imperial and colonial subjects, to imaginatively dominate and order various spaces of empire. The "boy" confronts "childlike natives" and often uncanny manifestations of the stubbornly resistant Indian "archaic." As will become abundantly clear, Kipling's fictions establish—as the preceding tradition of adventure and school literature begins to do—the "boy" as the principal, indeed representative protagonist in the "story" of British imperialism. Although my scholarship will strive to illuminate something of the relationship between Kipling's fictions and imperial history and to show how these fictions allude to and stage real practices of domination, my principal concern throughout will be to show how these fictions, by the mediation of the "boy," strive, not always successfully, to produce

coherent, attractive Imaginary and Symbolic envisionings of the British imperial enterprise, to show how the "boy" facilitates, yet also at times perturbs, Imaginary and Symbolic identifications of British imperial subjects with that enterprise. Kipling's "boy" images an imperial "ego-deal," an appealing imago for the imperial subject. Yet Kipling, in offering such ego-centered gratification, does not forswear the struggle to represent the British imperial project as Symbolically coherent, as the intersubjective undertaking of a community informed and sustained by shared codes and meanings. My next chapter, which considers the function of Kipling's "boy" in the allegorization of empire, will establish clearly and in detail the figure's dual role as Imaginary hero and as mediator of a Symbolic ordering of "the Empire."

The Jungle Books: Deployments of the "Boy" in Post-Mutiny Allegories of Empire

In Rule of Darkness, his recent study of British literature and imperialism. Patrick Brantlinger highlights the socio-cultural significance of the Indian Mutiny, observing, "at least fifty [Mutiny novels] were written before 1900, and at least thirty more before World War II. There was also a deluge of eyewitness accounts, journal articles, histories, poems and plays dealing with the 1857-58 rebellion" (199). As Hilda Gregg confidently affirmed, in 1897, "of all the great events of this century, as they are reflected in fiction, the Indian Mutiny has taken the firmest hold on the popular imagination" (qtd. in Brantlinger 199). More impressed, however, by the quantity than by the quality of Mutiny fiction, Gregg lamented that Rudyard Kipling (in 1897, a young writer at the zenith of celebrity) had not made his contribution to that already ample body of literature. Duly attentive to the inflammatory xenophobia of much Mutiny-inspired writing, Brantlinger attempts to account for Kipling's strange reticence, suggesting that "Perhaps Kipling intuitively avoided a subject that so tempted other writers to bar the doors against imaginative sympathy" (199).

That Kipling, an India-born advocate of empire, could remain so singularly dispassionate in his relation with the Mutiny topic seems to me a debatable hypothesis, especially when considered in relation to the more general thrust of Brantlinger's scholarship. "Victorian accounts of the Mutiny," Brantlinger observes, "display extreme forms of extropunitive projection, . . . an absolute polarization of good and evil, innocence and guilt, justice and injustice, moral restraint and sexual depravity, civilization and barbarism" (200). In the immediate aftermath of the event and throughout the remaining decades of the century, British Mutiny writing is characterized by sensationalism and "a general racist and political hysteria" (202). As Brantlinger asserts at the outset, "No episode of British imperial history raised public excitement to a higher pitch" (199). Making an abundantly documented case, he

establishes the 1857 revolt as an emotionally charged, key referent of later nineteenth-century, imperial myth-making and ideology. One must wonder how Kipling, frequently if not invariably a spokesman of imperial enthusiasms, could find himself without a word upon an imperial topic that provoked such general, intense, and sustained attention and emotion.

As James Morris affirms in Heaven's Command, "the emotions of the Mutiny found their echoes all over the British Empire, permanently affecting its attitudes, and leaving scars and superstitions that were never quite healed or exorcised" (246). The Mutiny stands as a moment of trauma in British imperial history, a moment difficult, perhaps, to confront yet impossible to ignore. Unlike so many of his predecessors and contemporaries—Flora Annie Steel, Meadows Taylor, G. A. Henty, among others—Kipling never produced any "historical fiction" of Mutiny events. As this chapter will demonstrate, however, the situations and events of the 1857 Mutiny inform Kipling's work in significant ways. Kipling engages with the emotionally charged questions of colonial insurgency and unrest the Mutiny topic arouses, although he does so, for the most part, obliquely, allusively and allegorically. Instances of post-Mutiny allegory, of narrative sequences organized upon allusive evocations of Mutiny scenarios occur in Kim and, more notably, in The Jungle Books, the text upon which my analysis will focus. Of central importance in Kipling's allegories of empire is the figure of the boy, who enables the Mutiny story's reconstitution as empire-affirming narrative discourse.[1]

---

[1]Later in his career, in Puck of Pook's Hill (1906) and Rewards and Fairies (1910), Kipling more overtly manifests his interest in and capacity for treatments of historical and folkloric material. Inspired by the wealth of archeological artifacts and fragments he discovers upon taking up residence at Bateman's, his Sussex estate, Kipling composes allegorical tales of English history touching upon a wide variety of periods. Particularly noteworthy, in relation to my reading of The Jungle Books as post-Mutiny allegory, is the later tales' blending of fantasy and fantastic elements with representations of history. As Donald Mackenzie affirms in his "Introduction" to Puck and Rewards, the tales in these collections are works of "archaeological imagination" (xiv ff.): mimicking the archeological experience of history, these tales stage "the

To consider Kipling as a post-Mutiny imperial allegorist requires that one place Kipling's fictions in relation with Mutiny history and, more particularly, with the British story of that history. In her Allegories of Empire, Jenny Sharpe considers the complex intertextual relation between the stories and histories of empire, advocating a historically informed reading of literary texts, but cautioning against "treating 'fact' and 'fiction' as repetitions of each other." Following upon initiatives of Pierre Macherey's The Theory of Literary Production, Sharpe proposes a critical orientation that strives to discover "the absent text of history in the margins of literature, as its unconscious or 'unsaid'." In Sharpe's view, "History, forming the conditions of existence of the literary imagination, places limits and restrictions on what can be represented at any one moment. Fiction is granted licence to imagine events as they might have happened or in a way that history has failed to record" (21). In so far as fictions may be said to represent "possible worlds rather than probable ones," critical analysis may take as its task "to show how [literary works] stage social contradictions and strive to resolve them" (21-22). Taking, then, the Indian Rebellion of 1857 as an

---

encounter of the remote and the alien with the immediate" (xiv), the wondrous and potentially anxious "encounter of the present with the alien and fragmented past" (xv). In a similar way, I would affirm, the fantastic tales that make up the Mowgli saga rework the rich and disturbing resources of Mutiny history and lore, implicitly asserting the present-tense imperial pertinence of harrowing themes and motifs associated with the Mutiny.

The "boy," I should add, remains the organizing figure of the later collections of tales. In the opening passages of "Weland's Sword," the first tale of the Puck collection, Dan and Una (the principal characters of the framing narrative of both Puck and Rewards) retire to "a large old fairy Ring of darkened grass" to rehearse a children's version of A Midsummer Night's Dream (7). Dan, fully costumed, plays the role of Puck. A sudden whistle announces the advent of a "genuine" Puck: "The bushes parted. In the very spot where Dan had stood as Puck they saw a small, brown, broadshouldered, pointy-eared person" (8, my emphasis). Thus, a metaphoric relationship of substitution binds the fairy who spurs and directs Kipling's narrative to the "boy" in whose place he appears.

"absent text" of Kipling's fictions, my analysis will strive to show how the history informs the fictions, and how the fictions reconstrue and reshape the history.[2]

As Morris observes, "The Indian Mutiny . . . was one of the decisive events of British imperial history, which set a seal upon the manner and purpose of the Empire" (Heaven's 222). Stating the case similarly but with greater specificity, historian Eric Stokes, in The Peasant Armed, writes,

> Popular cognizance of the modern history of the Indian subcontinent is limited appropriately to three episodes dignified by the names of "Clive," "the Mutiny," and "Gandhi." For these unerringly epitomize its three decisive historical phases—the colonial onset, the crisis of consolidation, and the colonial defeat and withdrawal. (1)

Stokes's commentary, here, is crucial for my critique, first, because it names "the Mutiny" as the organizing referent for a British imperial "crisis of consolidation," which is taken to characterize and inform the narrative of British-Indian encounter

---

[2]A synopsis of the Mutiny narrative may be helpful here. Early in 1857, rumors begin to circulate among the Sepoys (Indian soldiers) of Bengal. It is bruited that the cartridges of the new Enfield rifle--just now being introduced as standard issue--have been greased with pig and cow fat. The British, it is said, seek thus to defile the Sepoys and break their cast. In May, 1857, the Sepoys of Meerut rebel, then travel to Delhi to elicit the support of Bahadur Shah, last of the Mughal dynasts and nominally the King of India. Delhi soon falls to the rebels and revolt spreads rapidly. A Mahratha chieftain, Nana Sahib, undertakes a devastating siege of the British military station at Cawnpore (Kanpur) in June, capturing British women and children and holding them at the Bibighar ("the House of Women"), near Cawnpore. The captives are subsequently murdered and their dismembered bodies thrown into a well. (Rumors of the rape of English women at Delhi and at Cawnpore are broadly circulated, but are never verified.) In 1858, rebellion finds new sites, most notably at Lucknow (in Oudh), where the siege goes on for ninety days. Although Delhi is recovered by the forces of Nicholson and Hodson in September, 1857, it is the relief of Lucknow, under the leadership of Havelock, that marks the decisive turning point for the British cause. For a more detailed account of Mutiny history and story, see Morris (Heaven's 218-48). For a thorough treatment of British representations of the Mutiny, see Brantlinger (199-224).

through to Kipling's time and beyond, and, secondly, because it acknowledges the prevalent if potentially perturbatory influence of "popular cognizance" (or "the folk memory" [Stokes 1]) upon the historical analysis and evaluation of "the Mutiny." As Stokes observes, "the Mutiny" takes shape as "a period-piece" that "still holds Western attention because of the intimate, human scale on which the action was conducted"; it evokes "the picture-book world with which the later Victorian age peopled its imagination and named its streets and public houses" (1). The very vividness and abundance of Mutiny lore poses an acute problem even for the assiduous historiographer: "That the past should remain charged with emotion is the precondition of the historian's activity, but such emotion almost imprisons him within the framework of its own lines of interpretation" (4). To return to the "Mutiny scene" is to confront the compelling "power of [its] symbols," to attempt to wrest new meaning from deeply inscribed, socio-genetic "lines of interpretation" these symbols articulate.[3]

The uprisings of 1857-58 offered a deeply disruptive, multi-faceted challenge to British claims to colonial authority, a complex, multiply articulated calling into question of the reign of "justice" and "efficiency." Curiously, from the mid-nineteenth century through to the present day, the Indian rebellion has been insistently represented as "mutiny," as a military revolt against a constituted and—tacitly, ostensibly—

---

[3]The urge to remember the Mutiny vividly and concretely and, at the same time, to establish and maintain the "lines" of its interpretation, is clearly manifested in the post-Mutiny production of monuments and memorials. As Stokes observes, "The shell-pocked Kashmiri Gate at Delhi, where Nicholson stormed to victory and death with his avenging column, was left to point its moral. At Kanpur (Cawnpore) a weeping angel carved in marble by Marochetti was placed as a shrine over the well down which Nana's minions had cast the butchered remains of some two hundred British women and children, and in the stone surround was graven the simple scriptural epitaph: 'These are they who have come out of great tribulation'. At Lucknow the shattered remains of the Residency were left unrepaired, and from the tower the Union Jack continued to be flown day and night, as through most of the siege, the one spot in the British Empire where the flag was not lowered at dusk. So long as the Raj endured, the living force of these symbols remained" (2).

legitimate authority. Certainly, the Sepoys had rebelled against their British officers. Yet they were prompt in pursuing the capture of Delhi and in making their appeal to a higher authority, Bahadur Shah, nominally the "King of India." Although the Shah's participation in the rebellion was both cautious and coerced, the inscription of his name and that of his capitol upon rebel initiatives had considerable symbolic implications which the British could not ignore. As Stokes sums up the case,

> within the space of twenty-four hours, what began as merely the latest and ugliest of a long series of mutinous incidents in the Bengal army had swelled monstrously into full-scale political rebellion. Delhi, the capitol of the ancien régime, had assumed the leadership of a movement to liberate India from the white man's yoke. (18-19)

Thus, even the military insurrection rapidly acquired a more than military character. Moreover, as Indian nationalist historian Sashi Bhusan Chaudhuri emphasized, the Indian uprisings, as they developed, evidenced non-military, populist and regional aspects, which are effectively effaced by the name of "Mutiny." Stokes, in his study, speaks of a "Mutiny Rebellion," subdividing his topic into zones of military Mutiny or of civil Rebellion, submitting the revolt to a scrupulously regionalized analysis. Stokes stresses, moreover, that, among nineteenth-century British interpreters, "The nature of the 1857 uprising aroused fierce controversy from the outset." The name of "Mutiny" reflects a reassuring official perspective: "The official British explanation was that the Bengal Native Army alone had mutinied and that any civil disturbances were the natural by-products of the breakdown of law and order" (4). "Unofficial" sources perceived, however, "a formidable civil rebellion" or even "a national insurrection" evidencing "premeditated design" and, for some, "a Mohomedan conspiracy" (5-7). Yet another interpretation, more securely grounded in historical data, propounded a "peasant revolt" energized by disruptive British interventions in pre-existing local systems of property (9-12). This "predominantly economic interpretation," Stokes

observes, "is far from modern. Like most other theories of the revolt, it was one originally advanced by contemporaries." It obtained, moreover, a significant degree of purchase in powerful circles, among post-Mutiny policy-makers (11).

Clearly, what British imperial interpretations grapple with—affirming or disavowing, to varying degrees and in different ways—is the possibility that the "Mutiny" constituted "a broad, popular uprising," a generalized, if variously articulated, disaffection with and resistance to British rule—a view, as Stokes notes, that was not without its proponents in the post-Mutiny debate (13). During the 1857 revolt, India asserted itself as a multifarious socio-cultural territory, which assembled various classes, castes, regional groups and communities having various relationships with British colonial power. The insurrection, as history, therefore tended to resist British attempts to submit it to an all-encompassing interpretation, to generalize upon an event that appeared so spectacularly plural in its motives and its enactments. "In a real sense," asserts Stokes, "the revolt was essentially the revolt of a peasant army breaking loose from its foreign masters" (14). As such, it certainly revealed the precariousness of British power, both militarily and politically. "For as in all fragile military despotisms," Stokes astutely notes, "any mutiny of the army predicated political revolution" (15).

Still more curious, therefore, than its naming is the fact that this so-called "Mutiny" ultimately takes shape in the late Victorian popular imagination not as crisis but as triumph. First for journalists and subsequently for poets, novelists, historians, it becomes the object of an oft-repeated, obsessive return. As Brantlinger's richly detailed and evocative treatment reveals, in innumerable retellings the 1857 revolt finds the forms of the grand narrative, with its sites of tragedy ("the Well at Cawnpore"), its great actions ("the Relief of Lucknow"), its heroes and martyrs (Nicholson, Havelock) and its villains (Bahadur Shah, Nana Sahib). It becomes, to use the famous phrase of Anglo-Indian historian Charles Crosthwaite, "the epic of the race" (qtd. in Morris,

Heaven's 243). The historical event is thus transformed by its passage into popular discourse: it is recuperated for imperial ideology, and acquires, moreover, the status of folk-lore. The Indian Mutiny becomes, as Stokes suggests, a constituent element of the British Empire's story of itself—the very stuff imperial dreams are made on. Kipling, therefore, is able to retell the Mutiny story in a new and different way, to rewrite it in the form of another story. Kipling's allusive, allegorical fictions register imperial fear and desire, aspiration and doubt, drawing upon and contributing to a shared socio-genetic image-repertoire that emerges in response to the Mutiny crisis.

Clearly, then, this chapter will not strive to contribute to historiography of the 1857 rebellion, nor, certainly, to claim for Kipling any status as a historiographer. It will, however, demonstrate that Kipling fictionally restages Mutiny story and, in so doing, conspires with what Ranajit Guha calls "the prose of counter-insurgency," that is, the British "historiography" that strives to assimilate Indian anti-colonial insurrection "to the transcendental Destiny of the British Empire" (74). This writing of Indian history, like Kipling's rewriting of it, implicitly or explicitly "celebrate[s] a continuity—that of British power in India." It "serve[s] admirably to register the [insurgent] event as a datum in the life-story of the Empire, but do[es] nothing to illuminate the consciousness which is called insurgency" (71). Kipling, as I will demonstrate, renders the imperial "life-story" affirmatively yet allegorically. In his tale of a culturally hybrid imperial agent and, more extensively, in his tales of the feral boy who becomes, gradually but inevitably, the "Master of the Jungle," Kipling produces a fictional "prose of counter-insurgency," which attempts to resolve the enduring anxieties and unresolved tensions informing the history of British imperialism in India.

Although the greater part of my discussion will focus upon the Mowgli tales of The Jungle Books, I will begin with an examination of Kim, which will allow me to stage my critical process and to situate that process in relation to other initiatives of

contemporary colonial cultural studies. Unlike the Mowgli saga, the text of Kim directly addresses the Mutiny question in an episode that has been analyzed in some detail by Edward Said. Said's critique focuses upon a strategic repositioning of discourse, upon the fictive maneuver that ascribes pro-imperial, pro-British enunciations to Indian characters: a veteran sepoy, Said notes, speaks to Kim of the "madness" of the 1857 Rebellion, duly emphasizing the murder of "the Sahib's wives and children" and affirming that British reprisals served merely to call the rebels "to strict account" (Kim 52)—an almost vicious understatement of the facts. The old soldier's remembrances, Said affirms, thus reconstitute a Mutiny scenario "in which the native is naturally a delinquent, the white man a stern but moral parent and judge." In this brief episode, "Kipling gives us the extreme British view on the Mutiny, and puts it in the mouth of an Indian, whose more likely nationalist and aggrieved counterpart is never seen in the novel" (Culture 148). Imperial discourse, in this instance, attempts to fill in the potential site of counter-discourse, to pre-empt, by its apparent univocality and illusory fullness, the very possibility of a contestatory speech: the Sepoy veteran's discourse manifests the "other story" as a retelling of the "same story," the British story; the British view of the Mutiny, which construes anti-imperial insurgency as madness, is confirmed by a faithful colonial subaltern who re-enunciates it and, in so doing, completes and constitutes its truth-claim.

To neutralize the perceived threat of anti-imperialist resistance and insurgency, the Mutiny is posed as a topic in Kim and subjected to explicit and strategic retelling. More subtle and suggestive than this retelling, however, is the discursive maneuver that fictively restages Mutiny scenes, that reproduces, with significant alterations, Mutiny events or situations. Such restaging occurs when Kim, early in the novel, is called upon to carry a message for Mahbub Ali, an operative in the "Great Game" of imperial espionage. The message is passed from hand to hand hidden in "a flap of soft, greasy Mussalman bread" (21). To be more precise about characters and costumes, a Pathan

horse-dealer (Mahbub) tosses the bread to a holy man's disciple, a low-caste Hindu boy (Kim in disguise). This incident restages, in significantly altered form, the circulation of Indian flat breads, chapatis, which served, mysteriously, to spread the news of the 1857 uprising amongst the rural Indian populace.

The chapati episode occurs early in 1857, while the rumors of the greased Enfield cartridges are spreading. Within "the rural heartlands of the mutiny" (Bhabha, Location 200), strange series of actions take shape: a messenger arrives in a village, chapati in hand, passes the bread to the village headman, who dispatches it in turn—by another messenger, to another village. At the same time and in the same locales that rumors of revolt are spreading, the chapatis travel, passing from hand to hand, rousing powerful emotions wherever they go.

Following upon the work of historian Ranajit Guha, Homi Bhabha has recently argued that the chapati's passage functions as "the 'symbolic' transmission of rebel agency" within an economy of rumor. In "By Bread Alone: Signs of Violence in the Mid-Nineteenth Century" (Location), Bhabha writes,

> The indeterminacy of rumour constitutes its importance as a social discourse. . . . Its performative power of circulation results in a contagious spreading, "an almost uncontrollable impulse to pass it on to another person" [Guha]. The iterative action of rumour, its circulation and contagion, links it with panic—as one of the affects of insurgency. (200)

Thus the rumorous chapati is characterized, first, by an indeterminacy of meaning and, second, by specifiable affective content—alarm, panic fear. Like a "contagion," this feeling of alarm spreads promiscuously—among the colonized and also among the colonizers, the uncomprehending witnesses of the chapati's fearful progress. The circulation of alarm, of panic fear, has not, however, the same effects in both groups. For the Indian populace, it "constitutes the intersubjective realm of revolt and resistance" (Bhabha 200), producing an alert, well-roused, insurgent community. For

the British, panic, by its very presence, acknowledges loss of agency and manifests a crisis of authority.

The bread that passes from hand to hand in Kim clearly is not a sign within a strange and alarming process of social semiosis. Here, the bread itself does not signify at all, rather it conceals a message—it is mere camouflage. Similarly, the bread has lost its power of circulation, traveling no further than Kim, whose touch effectively breaks its charm and dispels its mystery. Kim, the liminal boy whose adolescence signals the undecided and undecidable status of his identity, is both Indian and European, both colonial subject and imperial agent. His "Indian-ness" makes the scene recognizable and readable as post-Mutiny allegory: seemingly, the bread is once again being passed from hand to hand between Indians. Kim's "Englishness"—"Kim was English" (1)—allows for a recasting of the scene in pro-imperial terms: appearances notwithstanding, one imperial agent (Mahbub) is passing to another (Kim) the news of a princely confederacy hostile to the Raj.[4] Liminal Kim is able to intercept the Mutiny chapati and recruit it to the service of British intelligence. Subsequently, the bread's secret message will travel with Kim to the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces and an Indian conspiracy will be nipped in the bud. Thus, an uncomprehended, fear-inspiring gesture of insurgency is fictively contained, demystified, co-opted. Kipling's little episode reassuringly rewrites Indian insurgency as British counter-insurgency.

In its allusive restaging of the Mutiny story, Kipling's Kim returns to a site of colonial terror, a narrative maneuver that would seem to problematize Said's assertion that "Kipling assumes a basically uncontested empire" (Culture 134) and that his novel's purpose is to represent "the absence of conflict" in the workings of the Indian empire (146). Kipling registers manifestations of contestation and resistance even as he

---

[4]One might even say the passing of the bread "interpellates" Kim as a subject and as an "agent" of the Raj. This scene constitutes Kim's initiation to the "Great Game."

strives to efface them: he reinvokes the Mutiny to re-enunciate it as "madness"; he rediscovers the trace of the Mutiny chapati to tame its fearful power. The chapati, metonymically the life-sustaining "daily bread" of Indian resistance and of British imperial anxiety, is a refractory element that must be imaginatively reworked, fictionalized, to make possible its assimilation within a project of Symbolic domination. To provide the chapati a place, however, in the colonizer's totalizing system of controlled meanings, is necessarily to choose fiction over fact, imperial story over colonial history. Unable to solve, as it were, the riddle of the Mutiny chapati, Kipling is obliged to manage it symbolically.[5] However, the historical chapati, with its fearfully cryptic contents, eludes capture, thus signalling what I take to be the characteristic limitation of Kipling's post-mutiny allegorization of empire: Mutiny history may sustain allegorical imperial narrative, may make it resonate, yet its allusive invocation also reveals the difference that alienates the story from the history it strives to rework. As my subsequent discussion of The Jungle Books will reveal still more clearly, Kipling's post-Mutiny allegory aims to resolve and dispel the anxieties that haunt British imperialism in the later nineteenth century. If, however, these fictions reassert and reconfirm the validity and viability of the British imperial mission, yet they acknowledge and reinvoke post-Mutiny doubts and fears, reasserting their presence and pertinence, giving them a renewed shape and substance.

My analysis of the Mowgli saga seeks to demonstrate, first, that Mowgli's Bildung is an empire-affirming allegorization of the history of British India and, secondly, that this allegorization is organized upon, and ultimately disrupted by, inscriptions of the

---

[5]I take this notion of symbolic management from Poovey, who argues that texts can perform the work of ideology by symbolically redistributing and reconfiguring disruptive, agonistic social issues, by "the symbolic resolution of contradictions or the management of destabilizing tensions" (19).

Mutiny moment. I begin by considering the triumphant representation of imperial consolidation in the tale of Mowgli's early manhood, "In the Rukh." Turning subsequently to the tales of boyhood, my argument identifies the adolescent Mowgli as an imperialist proxy, as a protagonist who represents the British imperial mission in the absence of the British colonizer. I then examine the structuring of Mowgli's world as an Indological India, as an imperial space constituted upon and deeply informed by Western "knowledge" of India. Moving on to a close examination of the jungle-boy's narrative progress, I demonstrate and analyze the unsettling, allegorical inscription of the Mutiny upon Kipling's jungle tales.

An oddity in the publication history of the Mowgli saga makes of it a narrative that discovers its resolution in advance of its elaboration, a drama that is preceded by its epilogue. "In the Rukh," published in Many Inventions in 1893, a year before the appearance of the first of the two Jungle Books, provides the comedic, empire-affirming dénouement of an as yet untold history: Mowgli, in the fullness of his youthful manhood, takes a wife and embarks upon a career of imperial service with the Department of Woods and Forests.[6] His two principal actions are intimately intertwined, each being contingent upon the other: by accepting an imperial career Mowgli assures himself of the status and income necessary to claim a wife; by taking a wife, he confirms his stable placement within the human community and hence his candidacy for imperial service. Mowgli espouses, at one and the same time, humanity and the empire.[7]

---

[6]John McBratney, in a recent article on The Jungle Books, affirms, as I do, the importance of "In the Rukh" as "the final framing story of the Mowgli series" (278). He does not, however, consider the full implications of this story's dual status as the first and the last of the Mowgli tales.

[7]McBratney, again, offers a similar argument, affirming "the decisive importance of the British Raj" in the resolution of Mowgli's "rival allegiances to bestial and human cultures" (287). Although he pays no attention to the social and symbolic importance

In 1894, readers of Kipling open The Jungle Book with the reassuring foreknowledge that the ambivalencies of Mowgli's drives and sympathies, of his identity and identification, will discover an appropriately imperial resolution: the feral child among the wolves will ultimately pursue his human destiny in the service the empire. He has been chosen, moreover, to play an important role within the imaginative economy of the British imperial project. As the text of "In the Rukh" announces in a moment of epiphanic revelation, Mowgli is to be a hero of the imperial Imaginary. Having tracked Mowgli through the woods, Gisborne, accompanied by the wood-demon's reluctant father-in-law-to-be, comes upon a wondrous pageant:

> There was the breathing of a flute in the rukh, as it might have been the song of some wandering wood-god . . . . The path ended in a little semicircular glade walled partly by high grass and partly by trees. In the centre, upon a fallen trunk, his back to the watchers and his arm round the neck of Abdul Gafur's daughter, sat Mowgli, newly crowned with flowers, playing upon a rude bamboo flute, to whose music four huge wolves danced solemnly on their hind legs. ("Appendix A" of The Jungle Books 345)

This sylvan flautist, this demi-god who commands the natural world, associates himself with Orpheus or Pan or, as Gisborne's German colleague, Muller, observes, with "Adam in der Garden" (344). The rukh is presented in this key scene as an enchanted glade, as a little world constructed upon Mowgli's personal and individual scale, a world where everything is fitted to him—within his reach, available to his grasp. As the young man states his case, "The jungle is my house" (346), and the wolf-brethren "my hands and feet" (347). Mowgli's lupine imago-figures have no longer the potentially threatening, confrontational aspect that they, along with the other jungle denizens, frequently reveal in the tales of the hero's jungle boyhood. The ego has

---

of Mowgli's marriage, McBratney usefully notes that the jungle-man finds (in addition to a wife) "a new father-figure" in Gisborne, a European, imperial "father" to replace his "bestial fathers . . . Kaa, Baloo, and Bagheera" (288).

tamed its images, which now dance in ceremonial obeisance to the music of a sovereign will. Mowgli enjoys, in other words, what one might describe (in Lacanian terms) as an ideal Imaginary relation with the jungle world: he is able to apprehend it in specular relation to himself, as a self-affirming system of similitudes and equivalences organized around his own body and selfhood.[8] He therefore provides the possibility of a personal, intimate envisioning of an alien world. Certainly, there is truth in Muller's lament, "I shall nefer know der inwardness of der rukh" (344). And Gisborne, the other imperial alien, might also voice such a lament were he not granted a vision of that mysterious inwardness. To appreciative British eyes, Mowgli offers a glimpse of a "real" India, of a "natural and essential" India residing beyond the confounding veil of culture.

It is curious, yet strangely apt, that Mowgli, the first and still the most famous of Kipling's adolescent heroes, should be a feral child. The Mowgli saga is written, in a dual sense, against existing knowledge of feral children: against the background of that knowledge, sustained by that knowledge; and yet, at the same time, against the content of that knowledge, in contestation of its findings and implications. Objects of public and scientific curiosity since the seventeenth century, feral children in Europe had been quite extensively documented by Linnaeus and others. Victor of Aveyron, a wild boy captured in 1798 (at the estimated age of eleven) and placed under the care and supervision of French physician Jean Itard, provides the most famous, most fully detailed case. Victor, under Nature's tutelage, acquires neither physical grace nor heightened sensibility and intelligence. As Sommerville remarks, he is, when first

---

[8]Bhabha affirms in a different way the importance of Lacan's conception of the Imaginary for colonial discourse theory: a process of Imaginary identification, which enables the subject "to postulate a series of equivalences, samenesses, identities, between the objects of the surrounding world," establishes and assures the colonial subject's relationship with the colonial "stereotype," which is, for Bhabha, a fundamental figure within colonialism's discourse of domination (Location 76-77).

apprehended, "a surly, snapping beast"—amoral, emotionally and intellectually stunted, sensorially deranged (134). "The crowds that turned out to watch Victor," Sommerville pertinently notes, "expected that in a few months he would have picked up enough of the language to offer some striking observations on his life in the wilds" (135). Here, precisely, Victor frustrates most acutely the cultural desire he provokes, responding in significant ways to socialization, but never learning to speak. Kipling chooses against the historical feral child, electing instead his Mowgli, who gratifies, allegorically, the desire the factual and historical Victor disappoints, who brings a voice, provides a view, into the silence and secrecy of an alien world—the colonial wilds.

This offering of a privileged view into the secret world of the Other is not, of course, the full extent of the jungle-boy's largesse. Mowgli in his enchanted glade also presents an ideal image of imperial authority. "To be above yet to belong," writes John McClure, "to be obeyed as a god and loved as a brother, this is Kipling's dream for an imperial ruler, a dream that Mowgli achieves" (60). And if Mowgli's power and knowledge must remain in large part mysterious, yet they are pledged to imperial service rather than to subversion and resistance: "I have eaten Gisborne's bread," Mowgli affirms, "and presently I shall be in his service, and my brothers will be his servants . . . " (347).

"Mowgli's paradise," ascertains John McBratney, "is not a creation independent of imperial politics but a coextensive product of it" (289). That Mowgli is not simply an Imaginary hero but a remarkably serviceable imperial hero is most saliently marked by Kipling's tale's subtle deployment and manipulation of the two modes of psychic identification which Slavoj Zizek, working from Lacanian psychoanalytic theory, has characterized as "imaginary" and "symbolic" identification. Emphasizing the crucial role of the gaze in processes of identification, Zizek explains,

> imaginary identification is identification with the image in which we appear likeable to ourselves, with the image representing "what we would like to be," and symbolic identification, identification with the very place from where we are being observed, from where we look at ourselves so that we appear to ourselves likeable, worthy of love. (105)

The clear and thorough apprehension of the significance of the enchanted glade experience requires, then, the recognition that it is (and must be) observed. The glade is not a site of free-standing, "private" experience, but rather the setting of a pageant, whose presentation within the narrative is contingent upon the advent of a spectator, Gisborne. As Zizek stresses,

> imaginary identification is always identification on behalf of a certain gaze in the Other. So, . . . apropos of every "playing a role," the question to ask is: for whom is the subject enacting this role? Which gaze is considered when the subject identifies himself with a certain image? (106)

Gisborne's status as the appropriate spectator is confirmed, of course, by the presence of an inappropriate candidate, Abdul Gafur, whose terror and abject incomprehension contrast sharply with the ranger's appreciative wonderment and signal the colonial subaltern's effective exclusion from the economy of ideal imperial identifications. While the fulfillments of Mowgli's Imaginary identification are contained within the glade (in the figures of the dancing wolves who "reflect" the jungle-master's sovereign status), his Symbolic identification is to be located in the figure of Gisborne, who provides the imperial presence and the imperial perspective. It is only in the eye of empire that the lupine sovereign of the jungle can fully appreciate his own charms. And of course, one should note that Mowgli repays Gisborne in the same coin, by offering himself, first, as a pleasing image-object of ideal imperial sovereignty (which finds in the other an obedient brother) and, subsequently, by returning the gaze—"Mowgli turning with his three retainers faced Gisborne as the Forest Officer came

forward" (347)—and thus providing the site of Symbolic identification, the perspective from which Gisborne (as the wondrous Mowgli's acknowledged master) appears agreeable to himself, worthy of esteem.

For both Gisborne and Mowgli, symbolic identification constitutes the empire-affirming nature of their encounter. "It is," writes Zizek, "the symbolic identification (the point from which we are observed) which dominates and determines the image, the imaginary form in which we appear to ourselves likeable" (108); the "interplay of imaginary and symbolic identification" occurs "under the domination of symbolic identification" (110). Both Gisborne and Mowgli locate symbolic identification in a representative of empire: Gisborne apprehends himself from the perspective of the Master of the Jungle, Mowgli from the perspective of the British imperial officer. Each character recognizes and accepts, in Symbolic relation to the other, "a certain 'mandate', . . . a certain place in the intersubjective symbolic network" (Zizek 110): Mowgli (together with the "retainers" of his little empire) is pledged to service in the British empire; Gisborne is confirmed as a duly empowered, responsible representative of British imperial authority. Ultimately, then, "the point of symbolic identification, the agency through which we observe and judge ourselves" (Zizek 108, my emphasis), is, for Mowgli as for Gisborne, the empire itself, or, more precisely, the imperial perspective, the gaze of empire. For both characters the Symbolic "trait-of-identification" (Zizek 105), the particularizing quality or characteristic that motivates identification, is imperial status. An idyllic and ideal envisioning of the imperial project is thus enabled by a finely balanced economy of complementary identification, which securely situates individual Imaginary gratification and self-fashioning within the defining Symbolic context of the British empire. But more crucially (for the analysis of the Mowgli saga that is to follow here), the seminal scene in the rukh announces a mutually sustaining Imaginary and Symbolic relation between Gisborne and Mowgli, between an imperial subject whose characterization is marked by historical

referentiality—there is, in British India, a Department of Woods and Forests; there are Forest Officers—and an entirely mythic, liminal boy. In "In the Rukh," the first and the last of the Mowgli tales, the narrative point of origin and of resolution, imperial subjectivity is produced in contingent relation with the myth-figure of the boy, who represents, in ideal terms, the empire, and who is represented, at the same time, from the perspective of empire.

Whereas Gisborne and Muller are active presences in "In the Rukh," the Mowgli tales of The Jungle Books contain not one European character. The English are a matter of rare allusion, a distant, vaguely understood presence that never intrudes upon the world of jungle and village. Imperialism, however, is always-already there in the Indian scene even in the absence of the imperialist; it is, as the preceding analysis of "In the Rukh" has shown, inscribed in advance as the beginning and the end of the narrative progress. The Mowgli saga, as it is detailed in The Jungle Books, allegorizes an imperialist world-view in the nearly absolute absence of an imperial Subject, inscribing and "naturalizing" imperial codes and values without immediate recourse to imperial agency and presence.

Crucial to this work of allegorization is the liminal boy (situated upon the "in-betweens" of the animal and the human, of nature and culture) who serves, even before the advent of Gisborne, as an imperialist proxy. Mowgli's jungle history repeats, in ideal form, the history of the British presence in India: a weak yet "bold" newcomer (who pushes his brethren-to-be aside to reach the she-wolf's nurturing teat) establishes himself in jungle society, gradually reorganizing the jungle world around himself and emerging, with time, as master. An imperial progress is refigured as an extraordinary Bildung, as a jungle-boy's life process of growth and maturation. As "Kaa's Hunting" clearly reveals, Mowgli receives an education in which imperial codes are re-envisioned as jungle laws: under Baloo, "the Teacher of the Law," Mowgli learns

more and different lessons than the young wolves do, receiving instruction in "the Master Words of the Jungle," which allow him to move freely and safely in jungle spaces controlled by potentially hostile jungle peoples (23). The imperial thrust of Mowgli's jungle formation is most clearly in evidence as the boy establishes relations with the specifically Indian world of the village. Employing quite sophisticated techniques of strategy and "intelligence," Mowgli, aided by his jungle allies, uses village bullocks to destroy his arch-enemy, Shere Khan. And when the jungle-boy moves against the village in "Letting in the Jungle," his mastery of techniques of surveillance and infiltration is still more clearly the key to his success. An insider/outsider in both the jungle world and the village world, liminal Mowgli is different from and superior to all other characters (animal or human) he encounters: he has always a mysterious supplementary power—the mystique of "Man" or the uncanny jungle knowledge. Native-born, yet set apart, Mowgli is different, undeniably special. Caught between two opposing worlds, divided in his identifications and his affiliations, he can be read as a fabulous, idealized analogue of the socio-cultural in-between-ness of an India-born Englishman (like Rudyard Kipling). With greater certainty, however, one can discover in Mowgli, the hybrid adolescent, an allegorical representative of a youthful, vigorous British imperial project and a figure of Kipling's ideal imperial subject, a subject capable of negotiating—not without hardship but with ultimate success—the antithetical demands of domination and assimilation.

Reading Mowgli as a protagonist of imperial allegory demands, of course, a reading of his world as allegorical fictional space. A reading such as mine would need to demonstrate, moreover, that Mowgli's progress toward the mastery of his world does not simply represent an archetypal, generalizable Bildung within a generalizable, more or less transcultural microcosm. At the literal level, the Mowgli saga is set in India, in an Indian jungle and, alternatively and secondarily, in an Indian village. However, allegorically too, India, or rather the "India" articulated by Western

Indology, is the principal referent of Mowgli's little world. Imperialism, the "absent presence" of the Mowgli tales of The Jungle Books, is inscribed, conceptually and tropologically, in relation to biased European knowledge systems that reconstruct India as the Western world's dominated and self-constituting Other.

In Imagining India, a revaluative, deconstructive study of Western Indology, Ronald Inden documents the development and consolidation, particularly during the nineteenth century, of the notion of Hinduism as the religion that expresses and effectively embodies the "Mind of India" (85 ff.). To understand Hinduism is, for the Indologist, "to grasp the mind of the entire [Indian] civilization" (86); in the words of Vincent Smith, British historian of India, "The unity underlying the obvious diversity of India may be summed up in the word Hinduism" (qtd. in Inden 86). Smith's one word, however, contains a wealth of Indologically ascribed meanings. Hinduism and, by extension, Indian civilization are made to represent the negation of conceptions of rational order bestowed upon Western thinkers by the Enlightenment. The Enlightenment's "principles of order," Inden recalls, are "mutual exclusion, unity, centredness, determinacy, and uniformity." Entirely antithetical to these principles, the Hinduism of Indology

> does not consist of a system of opposed but interdependent parts, but a wild tangle of overlapping and merely juxtaposed pieces. It is uncentred . . . , unstable . . . , and lacking in uniformity . . . . If Hinduism has a positive essence, it consists of its feminine imaginativeness, its ability to absorb and include, to move from one extreme to the other, and to tolerate inconsistencies. (88)

What Hinduism entirely lacks is Western "world-ordering rationality." Not surprisingly, therefore, "the most widely used metaphor" in Indological accounts of Hinduism "is that of Hinduism as a jungle" (Inden 86).

Kipling's use of jungle as the principal setting of his tales is not to be read, then, as the elimination of specific cultural traces and reference, but rather as the specification of cultural reference: Kipling's Indian jungle is not simply a culturally unmarked "World"; it is India as jungle. Like the "jungle" of Indian civilization, Kipling's manifests, in its nurturing adoption of the alien man-cub, a remarkable capacity "to absorb and include, . . . to tolerate inconsistencies." Significantly, however, as Mowgli soon discovers, his jungle home is not entirely lacking in world-ordering rationality: for all that it is a world of predation, where brute force is often the final arbiter, Kipling's jungle includes a "Jungle Law" quite distinct from "the law of the jungle." If, as one learns in "How Fear Came," the Jungle Law is mythic and archaic in its origins, yet it is eminently pragmatic in its applications. As the narrator informs the reader, as Mowgli learns from Baloo, this Law orders and codifies all the eventualities of jungle life. If it is not the work of reason, yet it is fully rationalizable.

Although on first consideration the inscription of the Law would seem to place Kipling's jungle world at odds with the Indologist's "jungle," the presence of Law—and, by implication, of world-ordering rationality—actually confirms the allegorical jungle's affiliation with Indological discourse more clearly and decisively than its absence might do. As Inden makes clear, Indology's "jungle" is disorderly, but, for the duly informed, analytically adept, Western specialist, not beyond reasoned comprehension. The "Hinduism" that reveals "no apparent order" is nonetheless posited as "knowable" (86). This "jungle" is "after all, a part of the orderly world in which the jungle officer of the Indian mind, the Indologist, wishes to live" (87).[9] Indeed, world-ordering rationality is precisely what Western systems of analysis and

---

[9]Given Kipling's characterization of Gisborne, Inden's use of the figure of the "jungle officer" is quite startling. As one might expect, Inden is borrowing the figure from the Indological discourses he criticizes. I am certainly tempted to surmise that Gisborne is drawn, at least in part, from the same source.

interpretation bring to the study of Indian civilization, just as Western legal and administrative intervention (supposedly) brings that same rationality to Indian cultural and political actuality. Indologists, observes Inden, "do not constitute an order out of the jungle, for it is inherently disorderly, but they can, it would seem, introduce a certain degree of rationality to it" (86). Even so, Kipling writes a jungle that knows disorder—for example, the interregnum that follows upon the fall of Akela—but also provides his jungle with an inscription of rational organization.

Significantly, the "rationalizing" of the jungle is energized by an alien element. As Hathi relates in "How Fear Came," the formation of the Law is instigated by the advent of an alien, Man, who sets in motion a chain of events that produce first Fear and then, in response to that Fear, the Law. In a somewhat similar way, the eventual arrival of a man-cub provokes a massive mobilization of the Law: Mowgli's reception is attended by a complex process of "litigation"; his initiation to the Law requires one full- and two part-time instructors; his mastering of the jungle ultimately entails his unique privilege of taking the Law into his own hands. Kipling's writing of the Law in the Indian jungle thus conforms quite closely to Indology's central tenet, "the idea that the Indian mind requires an externally imported world-ordering rationality" (128). Preceding Mowgli's arrival in Kipling's jungle is an imaginative, Indologically informed, sense-making intervention, which sets the stage for the jungle-boy's allegorical reconfiguration of British imperial history in India. In keeping with his status as a protagonist who negotiates, allegorically, an imperial "crisis of consolidation" (Stokes), Mowgli's role is not to initiate but to confirm the jungle's colonization—a role he fulfills very prettily in "In the Rukh."

As I noted earlier, Mowgli's world includes a secondary space, an Indian village. I characterize the village as secondary because of its lesser importance in the articulation of the boy-protagonist's life-story, because the jungle-boy is never allowed to discover a securely defined place within its structure, and, most importantly, because the village

is clearly represented as subordinate to the jungle, the defining space in Kipling's fictive world. As is made clear when the jungle is "let in" upon it, the village is, in the last instance, a differentiated space within the jungle world, a space the jungle has the power to "de-differentiate" and reclaim. It is noteworthy, moreover, that Kipling's portrayal of the relationship between jungle and village reverses the expected distribution of the terms of contrast: in the jungle, there is law; whereas, the village, a place of folk-loric "tall tales" and superstition, is ultimately lawless—like the Monkey-People's anarchic community, which provides (as Mowgli duly notes) the jungle-analogue of village society. Kipling envisions his village as an insular, tenuously differentiated space within an encompassing, ultimately dominant order, the jungle, even as the Indian village is envisioned by the Raj as an insular, representatively Indian, social structure encompassed by, and securely contained within, the British colonial administration.

Kipling's village, like his jungle, reveals its close affiliation with British Indological discourse. As Inden argues, the Indian village, an object of British survey and classification throughout the nineteenth century, becomes, like India's "jungle"-mind, another "pillar of . . . imperial constructs of India" (132). As the "living essence of the ancient" (131), the village-construct enables Indological discourse to contrast the "archaic" (as represented by the Indian village) with the "modern" (as represented, of course, by British imperial government):

> [T]he constitution of India as a land of villages was . . . due to the efforts of the British to deconstitute the Indian state. As they were composing their discourses on India's villages, they were displacing a complex polity with an "ancient" India . . . . The essence of the ancient was the division of societies into self-contained, inwardly turned communities consisting of co-operative communal agents. The essence of the modern was the unification of societies consisting of outwardly turned, competitive individuals. Just as the modern succeeded the ancient in time, so the modern would dominate the ancient in space. (132)

Kipling's Mowgli tales first displace Indian socio-political structures on to the relatively simple, yet ostensibly representative village, then submit this same village to very literal extinction. Even a cursory consideration of Kipling's jungle-boy reveals that he is clearly (if somewhat surprisingly) imbued with the spirit of modernity: starkly an "individual," he is an "outwardly turned" character who competitively seeks dominion over others, a character whose thrust will inevitably set him at odds with the "inwardly turned," organic and exclusive community of the village. My subsequent analysis will demonstrate that Mowgli's relationship with the Indian "archaic," as manifested by the village and, in a different way, by Shere Khan, is intransigently aggressive, a relationship that is only to be resolved by the extremity of violence. As is already clear, however, Kipling's village figures forth an "ancient" Indian social structure posited by an imperial knowledge system and pledged to destruction by the irresistible "modern" force of imperial power. The village is not simply "the social world" any more than the jungle is simply "the natural world": both these fictive spaces represent highly specific Indological and imperial constructs for the imaginative ordering of colonial India.

Notwithstanding the rather assiduous, preparatory organization of his allegorical world, Mowgli's rise to prominence and power within his microcosmic Indian empire does not proceed without noteworthy instances of trial and contestation. It is in such instances that the shadowy and fearful presence of the Mutiny can be discerned. Despite Mowgli's liminal placement between worlds, which signals his potential capacity to allegorically negotiate cultural difference, the narration of his Bildung allows no place for an India that resists. The boy invariably resolves adversarial confrontations by violence and, in a singularly important, defining instance, by the effacement of the inimical Indian Other.

The earliest and also the most obdurate adversary Mowgli must confront is Shere Khan. The tiger shares his name with a sixteenth-century Afghan chieftain, who

invaded the subcontinent and, for a short time, unseated the Mughals. As Percival Spear observes, Sher Khan (also Sher Shah) is commonly credited with being "the virtual founder of the future Mughal empire on the ground that he provided the essential administrative framework" (28). The tiger's name thus associates him with the conquest and consolidation of empires. Significantly, Kipling's Shere Khan is old and lame, yet very dangerous—a rogue tiger, a cattle-killer, a man-hunter. Both in relation to the wolf pack and in relation to the human society of the village, he is an outsider—almost an "alien," very much an outlaw.[10] Mowgli, another outsider, but one who becomes an initiate and a representative of the law, stalks and kills the tiger and by that richly symbolic act establishes himself unambiguously as an imperial protagonist.

As Sujit Mukherjee emphasizes in "Tigers in Fiction: An Aspect of the Colonial Encounter," the tiger and the tiger-slayer are significant figures in British imperial mythologies. The myth-tiger of imperial imaginings purportedly has its origins in the north and is frequently envisioned as a "white tiger." A pale invader from the north, this tiger "is clearly reminiscent of the fair-complexioned Indo-Aryan or Caucasian tribes who are believed to have entered from the north and conquered India several thousand years before the British did" (Mukherjee 11). The tiger-hunt thus takes shape as a contest between conquerors, one modern and one archaic. By his victory over the tiger, the British tiger-slayer implicitly lays claim to imperial authority, as the tiger's successor. Similarly, the killing of the tiger refigures the British conquest of India as a kind of return, as the re-enactment of an earlier "white" conquest.[11]

---

[10]To place this affirmation of the tiger's "outsider" status in relation with Inden's scholarship, I should emphasize that Shere Khan is not associated with "Hindu" India, which, as Inden makes clear, is envisioned as the true, essential India. As I have begun to show, the tiger's symbolic affiliation is with Mughals and Afghans.

[11]Kipling's imaginative participation in an imperial thematics of the tiger-hunt is most clearly revealed in "The Tomb of his Ancestors" (The Day's Work), in which young

Mowgli, by overcoming Shere Khan, stands in the place of the British imperial adventurer and re-enacts allegorically the British domination of the subcontinent. This jungle-child (youthful and energetic, yet duly schooled in the codes of the law) is the alien liberator whose final victory signals the establishment of just rule in the place of an ostensibly corrupt and decrepit Mughal dynasty. As the rebel Sepoys of 1857 looked to Bahadur Shah for leadership, so, during a troubled period of interregnum within the Seeonee pack, restless young wolves rally around Shere Khan and turn against Mowgli. Just as the British, in 1858, put an end to the already largely symbolic kingship of Bahadur Shah, so Mowgli puts an end to the lame tiger's pretensions to power. As the British, after 1858, articulated "a new imperial order . . . through Mogul emblems of power" (Sharpe, Allegories 4), so Mowgli uses the tiger's splendid skin to symbolize his accession to the role of master of the jungle. The story of Mowgli's ultimately victorious struggle against Shere Khan thus mirrors key features of Mutiny history and of the British reconstitution of that history, recapitulating a British "triumph" in the midst of treachery and adversity.

The death of Shere Khan, however, cannot be taken to announce an end of imperial anxieties, because, as Mukherjee remarks, the myth-tiger is never definitively dead:

> Particularly when we recall the nature and range of human qualities attributed to the tiger by Anglo-Indian writers of fact as well as fiction—memory, cunning, vengefulness, to mention only three—we shall realize that the tiger represented some enduring spirit of India that the British felt they had failed to subjugate. No matter how many successful campaigns the British had waged, how many decisive battles they had won, how many cantonments they had founded to guard settlements, some basic fear of India continued to haunt British Indian life and imagination. Therefore the tiger had to be shot again and again. (12)

John Chinn, a newcomer to colonial service, successfully undertakes an initiatory tiger hunt and thus confirms himself as the rightful successor—indeed, the reincarnation—of his grandfather, John Chinn, a highly revered district administrator.

One can begin, at this point, to appreciate the full resonance of Kipling's allusion (in his title, "'Tiger! Tiger!'") to William Blake's tiger of "fearful symmetry," eternally burning—or perhaps smouldering— "in the forests of the night."

The Mowgli saga, evidently, must be considered as an optimistic yet anxious discourse, as a narrative that assuages yet also revives the nagging doubts and fears troubling post-Mutiny British India. In this spirit, I would suggest that Mowgli's victory over the tiger not only looks back upon the Mutiny scene, but also looks forward, from the perspective of the Mutiny, to the future defeat of a future (Afghan) "marauder." Sher Khan, one must recall, was an opportunistic Afghan conqueror before Kipling's fiction transformed him into a tiger—a tiger that must be killed again and again. In the last decades of the nineteenth century—that is, during the years that Kipling was forging his literary career—the perceived threat of an invasion of India, by allied Russian and Afghan forces, inflamed post-Mutiny anxieties (Spear 156; Morris Pax, 276-77). The British had not forgotten the Afghan campaign of 1842, a fiasco that ended with a humiliating rout. And they were aware of Russian diplomacy in Afghanistan, but uncertain as to its scope and intention. The fidelity of the Indian populace, and, more importantly, that of the Indian armed forces (upon which the security of the Raj depended) seemed uncertain. It was feared that an Afghan initiative might occasion a rebellion more extensive and more costly than that of 1857.[12] Given this historical context, it is fair to suggest that the figure of Shere Khan (the tiger) acknowledges, indeed evokes, the Afghan threat, the fear of which is then assuaged by

---

[12]In "Drawing the Color Line: Kipling and the Culture of Colonial Rule," Satya P. Mohanty notes "the vague and generalized sense of threat" coexisting with post-Mutiny triumphalism, "a feeling that even though future revolts might be averted, colonial rule had become precarious" (324). The Afghan menace thus gives a specific form to more generalized fears. In the words of H. S. Cunningham, writing in the late 1880s, the situation in post-Mutiny colonial India "has its own law of stability; once disturbed, it may defy the universe to restore it, and its crash may mean a second chaos" (qtd. in Mohanty 324).

the cathartic killing of the tiger. In so saying, I do not intend to substitute this present interpretation for the preceding ones. The overall point is rather that Mowgli kills several tigers in the same fictive moment. The tiger, in my view, is an overdetermined figure, a site of multiple belief: Shere Khan is the allegorical representative of the Mughal dynasty; he is also, at the same time, a post-Mutiny embodiment of the unassimilable, "archaic" otherness of India and of a deep-seated, irrational British fear of India; and he is also, at the same time, the Afghan marauder hovering menacingly upon the margins of Indian society. The tiger is, was, will be. Within the post-Mutiny historical context, the figure of the tiger accrues meanings.

As a site of multiple allusions, the figure of the tiger tends, of course, to compromise and perturb the one-to-one relationship between the narrative element and its symbolic referent that typically characterizes the allegorical text. The treatment of the tiger manifests not the term-for-term substitution of metaphor but rather the potentially multiple associations of metonymy. As Lacan makes clear in "The Agency of the Letter in the Unconscious or Reason Since Freud" (Écrits), the unconscious "agency" of the textual signifier is most notably revealed in its metonymies: "displacement" is "that veering off of signification that we see in metonymy, . . . which from its first appearance in Freud is represented as the most appropriate means used by the unconscious to foil censorship" (160). Making a decidedly destabilizing intervention in the arena of Saussurean linguistics, Lacan denounces "the illusion that the signifier answers to the function of representing the signified" (150), arguing that the signifier refers not to a singular, stable signified (as Saussure had posited) but always invariably to another signifier. A "sliding of the signified under the signifier," he affirms, "is always active in discourse (its action . . . is unconscious)" (160). Metonymic process, as exemplified in "free association" (163), may thus be taken to represent the inevitable mise-en-abîme of signifying practice inflected by the unconscious: each signifier refers to another signifier, which refers to another

signifier, and so on. As Lacan poetically puts the case, "the ring of meaning flees from our grasp along the verbal thread" (166); we speak ourselves, our desires, our meanings in terms that are not ours to command. The overdetermination of "Shere Khan" may therefore be taken to demonstrate that Kipling's writing process—like all discursive processes, Lacan would affirm—is in part an unconscious process in which the production of meaning is not in the speaking subject's control. Similarly, the process of reading the Mowgli saga would potentially involve an unconscious process—which this chapter strives to trace and articulate—an unconscious response to affectively charged, suggestively resonant words, themes, images, and scenes. By evoking British fears of primordial India, by recalling not only "archaic" India, but also the less remote Mughal dynasty and its pretensions to continuing power and authority, and also the more pressingly contemporary Afghan "menace," the tiger reveals more fully the contents of Said's description of the Mutiny as "a symbolic event." The Mutiny, as Kipling's resonant deployment of the tiger reveals, is the key orienting element in Kipling's general envisioning of British India and its history: it is the Mutiny that inflames and informs fear of "archaic" India; the Mutiny necessitates the representation of a "lame" and decrepit Mughal dynasty in relation to which British usurpation may appear legitimate and just; the Mutiny enables the rendering of the Afghan threat as yet another version of an undying spirit of resistance and rebellion, a spirit that the never-quite-dead tiger embodies.

Already in "'Tiger! Tiger!'" the significance of the tiger-vanquisher's achievement goes unrecognized and unappreciated by those it presumably benefits most: Mowgli becomes the object of the villagers' superstitious fear and loathing and is cast out from village society. However, it is in the sequel tale, "Letting in the Jungle," that the narrative organizes itself around themes of treachery and violence, punishment and revenge, and emerges most clearly as post-Mutiny allegory. To effectively read "Letting in the Jungle" as a post-Mutiny allegory requires a focusing of attention upon

the production of a certain thematics of femininity within the tale. Mowgli's revenge upon his enemies is inspired not so much by violence against himself as by violence against his mother: upon seeing Messua's blood, Mowgli ominously declares, "There is a price to pay." Messua's role in Kipling's story parallels that of "the English lady" (Sharpe) in inflammatory Mutiny narratives: the violence done to her justifies the most extreme reprisals.

As Gayatri Spivak has observed, "To mark the moment when not only a civil but a good society is born out of domestic confusion, singular events that break the letter of the law to instill its spirit are often invoked. The protection of women by men often provides such an event" ("Can" 298). In response to the Mutiny crisis, British counter-insurgency, in its effort to restore order and assert the "rightness" and necessity of British authority, took the form of punishments whose barbarous extremity was justified by the invocation of a moral imperative, the protection of women. In much the same way, Mowgli "protects" Messua by instigating a suspension of Jungle Law and unleashing the jungle's savage, "primordial" forces of destruction upon an offending village. In "The Unspeakable Limits of Rape: Colonial Violence and Counter-Insurgency," Jenny Sharpe argues,

> During the 1857 uprisings, a crisis in colonial authority was managed through the circulation of 'the English Lady' as a sign for the moral influence of colonialism. A colonial discourse on rebellious Sepoys raping, torturing, and mutilating English women inscribed the native's savagery onto the objectified body of English women, even as it screened the colonizer's brutal suppression of the uprisings. (29)

In Kipling's tale, Messua too is produced as an object, as a body whose function it is to serve as a focus for violence, as the body that must be violated if the narrative is to move forward. She provokes the action by providing an image of outraged virtue and kindness.

Just as importantly, Messua serves as the site of a displaced violence, of a violence that must, if she were absent, expend its full force upon Mowgli himself. As Sharpe points out, the public narratives of the events of 1857-58 rarely produced the broken bodies of English men. To have acknowledged this much more pervasive reality of the Indian uprisings would have been

> [to deny] British power at the precise moment it needed reinforcing. . . . Once an English man has been struck down, then anything is possible; in death his mortality is revealed and sovereign status brought low. A focus on the slaughter of defenseless women and children displaces attention away from the image of English men dying at the hands of native insurgents. ("Unspeakable" 34)

Clearly, the symbolic importance of the "English man" resides in his being the representative of constituted imperial order and authority. In a like manner, authority and order in Kipling's allegorical empire (in the little world composed of lawful jungle and ultimately lawless Indian village) are centered upon the figure of Mowgli, the Master of the Jungle. In "'Tiger! Tiger!'" Mowgli does, in one brief moment, fall victim to village violence: a cast stone bloodies the boy's mouth. Mowgli's being bound, beaten, and imprisoned by the villagers, however, would entirely undermine his charismatic authority and dispel the illusion of his heroic invulnerability. This much more humiliating violence, which would constitute not a provocation but a defeat, is therefore displaced upon Messua.

Of course, "Letting in the Jungle" does present a male victim of violence, a rather significant one—Messua's husband, Mowgli's human father. Kipling's rendering of this male victim, however, serves to confirm violated "woman" as the site of narrative focus. As Mowgli secretly enters the hut where his mother and father are being held—prisoners awaiting torture and death—the articulation of Kipling's text deftly shifts

attention away from the male victim onto the injured and outraged female, carefully constituting violence against "woman" as the violence that signifies:

> Messua was half wild with pain and fear (she had been beaten and stoned all the morning), and Mowgli put his hand over her mouth just in time to stop a scream. Her husband was only bewildered and angry, and sat picking dust and things out of his torn beard.
>
> 'I knew—I knew he would come,' Messua sobbed at last. 'Now do I know that he is my son!' and she hugged Mowgli to her heart. Up to that time Mowgli had been perfectly steady, but now he began to tremble all over, and that surprised him immensely.
>
> 'Why are these thongs? Why have they tied thee?' he asked, after a pause.
>
> 'To be put to death for making a son of thee—what else?' said the man sullenly, 'Look! I bleed.'
>
> Messua said nothing, but it was at her wounds [Kipling's emphasis] that Mowgli looked, and they heard him grit his teeth when he saw the blood.
>
> 'Whose work is this?' said he. 'There is a price to pay.' (193)

The passage names Messua, but not "her husband." Although "the man" cries out for attention—"Look! I bleed"—he receives none. Conforming to the pattern of Mutiny reprisals, Mowgli's revenge shapes itself around imagery of violated femininity.

It would be worthwhile, at this juncture, to consider the answer to Mowgli's question, "Whose work is this?" His father answers, "The work of all the village" (193). The crime to be punished is the action not of specific individuals but of an entire community.[13] Here, Kipling's narrative arrives at the core of the contradictory logic characterizing British response to the Indian Rebellion. On the one hand, the

---

[13]As Inden observes, Indology understands Indian villagers only as collective actors. In addition to conforming to this Indological idea, Kipling's generalization of responsibility and guilt also mirrors actual legal and administrative initiatives that follow upon the Mutiny. "The provincial governments," for example, "recommended that magistrates be allowed to search people's homes for arms at whim, and that if arms were found in one house, the entire village be held culpable" (Mohanty, "Drawing" 324).

Rebellion is constructed as a "mutiny," as a thwarting of authority that has a specific and delimited context—the military hierarchy. But, on the other hand, the ascription of responsibility and guilt is generalized: to be Indian is to be guilty. Reprisals therefore enjoy the very broadest scope: not only rebel sepoys but chance-encountered peasants can be given over to summary execution; whole villages can be razed; estates and temples can be vandalized and looted (see Morris, Heaven's 243-46).

In Kipling's tale, treachery and outrage are not punished by bloody atrocities. The villagers are spared, though their village is utterly destroyed, effaced. Kipling thus restages one specific strategy of British counter-insurgency, and his choice is quite significant: Mowgli spares the villagers' lives, but destroys all traces of their shared existence as a community, all the material manifestations of their society and culture. Certainly, Mowgli's revenge does stop short of the British excesses of 1857-58, but in evaluating this fact, one should recall the fundamental optimism of The Jungle Books.[14] Messua and her husband are saved from violent death; the captives of the Bibighar were not. Kipling's tale does not really oppose the logic of British reprisals; it confirms and reinforces that logic. While this tale is clearly marked as a post-Mutiny allegory, it stops short of invoking "unspeakable" acts of rape and mutilation. Although atrocities are suggested—"Let us see if hot coins will make them confess!" (199)—Mowgli's heroism pre-empts their enactment. If one considers, then, the relation of the crime to the punishment, one can detect the influence of the extreme

---

[14]In speaking of the optimism of The Jungle Books and of the restraint that is evident in Kipling's treatment of his subjects, I should recall that Kipling's jungle tales, since their first appearance, have enjoyed a general readership and an assured status as "juvenile literature." That Kipling intentionally addressed these works to children is evident in such designations as "Mother Wolf" and "Father Wolf" and in occasional authorial interventions—"But that is a story for grown-ups" (64). "Letting in the Jungle" presses upon but ultimately respects the tacitly drawn boundaries of the Victorian children's story.

emotional responses Mutiny scenes can evoke. Messua, an innocent woman, is bound and beaten; her son, to avenge the abuse, eradicates an entire village.

Interestingly, Mowgli's revenge takes shape as a sort of abandonment: the jungle is "let in" upon the offending village. The archaic and chaotic forces, which Mowgli had symbolically mastered by killing the tiger-marauder, are unleashed, allowed to return. Not jungle law but a kind of primordial jungle madness takes possession of the village, negating, indeed eradicating, all vestiges of socio-cultural order: "by the end of the Rains," writes Kipling, concluding his tale, "there was the roaring Jungle in full blast on the spot that had been under the plough not six months before" (210). Kipling thus portrays, allegorically, the fate of a rebellious India. There would be no need of active punishment. India might simply be left to itself, abandoned to the misrule and disorder that supposedly preceded the establishment of British government.[15] And indeed, even at the literal level of the story, British government—although distant and but dimly comprehended—represents the sole possibility of order and justice: it is to "the English" at Khanhiwara that the fugitive victims of injustice and brutality must fly.

In the last analysis, of course, Mowgli's agency in the destruction of the village is far from passive; he does not merely "unleash" the jungle's destructive forces, he commands and directs them. In "Letting in the Jungle" as in "'Tiger! Tiger!'" the resolution of conflict requires a decisive act of violence. In Kim too the evocation of the Mutiny (in the "chapati episode") occurs as part of a narrative movement that culminates in a counter-insurgent military action. The liminal boy, who would seem to bear the promise of new possibilities for the negotiation of agonistic colonial encounter,

---

[15]Here, Kipling's implicit theme—India's presumed incapacity for ordered self-government—patterns itself upon widely held, popular and official notions. In Pax Britannica, James Morris sums up the British attitude quite nicely: "By the end of the century most people assumed, not least the public and the policy-makers at home, that an India without the British would fall apart in communal violence, and relapse into the chaos from which the Empire was supposed to have rescued it" (125).

does not in fact provide alternatives that differ significantly from those of 1857-58. "In the Rukh" stages, as I have shown, the liminal boy's capacity to experience seamless union with the spaces and societies of the colonial "wilds"; it reconfigures the imperial project as a masterful participation in the world of the colonial Other. Another sort of masterful participation is evident in Kipling's Indologically informed constitution of the protagonist's allegorical world. Nonetheless, Mowgli's world includes elements that offer an intransigent resistance to the process of imperial domination, assimilation, and incorporation represented in Mowgli's Bildung. The "otherness" of colonial spaces and cultures, for a Mowgli or a Kim seemingly graspable and assimilable, is evidently not so readily accessible for the imperial imagination that wishfully produces such characters. Indeed, the function of the Imaginary hero, a fictive projection of an ego-ideal, must ultimately be located in his representation of a fullness, a wholeness, in the place of the imperial subject's limitation and lack. As Edward Said has argued, the liminal boy can be made to serve as an enabling figure in the representation of a putative "absence of conflict" in imperial affairs (Culture 140-41). Yet situated in the context of a Mutiny "scene of writing," where colonial terror and conflict are manifest, the liminal boy follows upon the actions of his less gifted predecessors, resolving the terror and the conflict as the British forces did during the mid-century crisis.

By way of concluding this discussion, I will briefly step outside the Mowgli saga, but remain within The Jungle Books. Examined in relation with "Letting in the Jungle" (the tale that immediately precedes it), "The Undertakers" appears to present an interesting turn in Kipling's narrative strategy. The former tale allegorically reinvokes and revives the actions and emotions of the Mutiny story. "The Undertakers," which contains explicit allusions to Mutiny events, attempts to bring the Mutiny narrative definitively to a close, or at least to assert the possibility of closure.

In this tale, the forces of colonial disorder are embodied—most compellingly if not exclusively—in a gigantic crocodile, "the Mugger of Mugger-Ghaut," a monster that grows fat upon Mutiny corpses. When, however, he stalks a refugee-boat and tries to carry off a British boy, the boy's mother—in the heroic style of "the Judith of Cawnpore" (see Sharpe, Allegories 69-73; Brantlinger 295n)—rewards the overly intrepid mugger with several shots from her revolver.[16] The boy thus saved grows to manhood, becomes an engineer—the very man in charge of the building of a railway bridge at Mugger-Ghaut. Upon completing the bridge, the engineer shoots and kills the crocodile, ending his fearful reign over the village that bears his name.

It is the successful building of the bridge that announces the end of uncanny, archaic, Indian monster, the mugger that gorges himself upon Mutiny horrors. The death of the mugger seems almost to be a necessary effect of the triumphant manifestation of British technological and administrative know-how.[17] The bridge manifests new possibilities for communication and exchange in the erstwhile divided

---

[16]The Cawnpore "Judith" is famously imaged in an illustration from Charles Ball's 1858 history of the Mutiny, an illustration which is reproduced in Brantlinger (198) and provides an apt and arresting "detail" illustration for the cover of Sharpe's Allegories. The porcelain-pale "Judith" (one Miss Wheeler) is shown with blazing pistol in hand, stalwartly defending herself against notably "black-faced" attacking Mutineers. According to Mutiny lore, Miss Wheeler "killed her captor and his family." Overcome by the shame of interracial rape—or so the story goes—she subsequently "committed suicide by throwing herself down a well." As Brantlinger usefully notes, however, the historical Miss Wheeler was "the racially mixed daughter of Major-General Wheeler," the Cawnpore commanding officer. She did not, in fact, "kill her abductor and commit suicide," but rather "converted to Islam and married her captor (or was he her rescuer?)" (Brantlinger 295n). With admirable clarity, then, the rendering of "Judith"-Miss Wheeler exemplifies the recuperation of a problematic history by an imperial story—the very discursive process with which I have been concerned in this chapter.

[17]The mugger's status as an embodiment of "archaic" India is confirmed in "The Bridge-Builders" (The Day's Work). In an opium-induced dream-vision, the bridge-builder, Findlayson, confronts the ancient gods of India, among them "Mother Gunga," fearful goddess of the river the engineer's bridge will span, who appears in the form of a "blunt-nosed, ford-haunting Mugger" (24).

spaces of empire. And in lieu of a liminal Mowgli, this story offers a different sort of hero, a boy who is saved from the grim menace of the Mutiny, spared to become a bridge-builder. This imperial protagonist is evidently secure in his British cultural identity but possessed nonetheless of the capacity to negotiate cultural difference in the divided, agonistic spaces of empire. His answer to the problems of the Eastern empire is technical rather than intuitive—the engineering (physical and social) of modernization. And yet the bridge and the bridge-builder, being nothing more than new manifestations of an on-going imperialist project, bring no really new potentiality to post-Mutiny allegory. The British-Indian colonial confrontation resolves itself once again in favor of the imperialist and by means of extreme violence: the mugger, like the tiger before him, must be shot. As if by the blast of "a small cannon (the biggest sort of elephant-rifle is not very different from some artillery)" (232), the Mutiny crocodile is blown apart, "literally broken into three pieces" (233). The mugger's grisly end recalls the brutal execution of rebel Sepoys, many of whom "were lashed to the muzzles of guns and blown to pieces" (Morris, Heaven's 245). Thus, the closure of the Mutiny story, which "The Undertakers" seems intent to announce, is really only another return to that story, one more return to a story for which no imperial resolution is possible.

Recalling Michel Foucault's assertion that discourse is "a violence we do to things," Stephen Slemon defines colonial discourse as "that system of signifying practices whose work it is to produce and naturalize the hierarchical power structures of the imperial enterprise, and to mobilize those power structures in the management of both colonial and neo-colonial cross-cultural relationships" (6). Considering the example of imperial allegory, Slemon goes on to suggest that the discourse of colonialism strives to recuperate its Other "by reference to [the colonizer's] own systems of cultural recognition" (7). Following from Slemon's argument, I would suggest that, at least for colonial discourse in Kipling's historical moment, the mid-

century Indian Rebellion stands as an instance of the irreclaimable; the Mutiny, that is, manifests itself as British imperialism's limit-text, the social, historical "text" that can neither be circumvented nor made to serve. The Mutiny history is a constitutive element in the empire's story of itself, yet it also invariably interrupts that story by inscribing the agency of intransigent opposition, by speaking the story of the rebel. Imperial "systems of cultural recognition" can provide no secure and stable placement for such agency, for such a story—hence the overdetermined tiger that must be shot again and again or the hideously uncanny, unrecognizable crocodile that must be blown to bits. As Guha observes, in the prose of counter-insurgency "the rebel has no place . . . as the subject of rebellion" ("Prose" 71). Significantly, however, in The Jungle Books the place of the rebel element is not simply empty. It is designated and then voided, submitted, in psychoanalytic terms, to an action of disavowal. In Kipling's post-Mutiny imperial allegories, domination ultimately requires a violent self-assertion, a violent disavowal of the presence and agency of the colonial Other. Allegorical empire, like the historical empire upon which it is predicated, is sustained by a violence that never achieves its final act. One cannot put an end to the Mutiny story, one can only return to it—again and again.

Kipling's allegorization of empire in the Mowgli saga does reflect what Said has characterized as the "consolidated vision" of British imperial culture. Kipling writes, that is, "from the perspective of a massive colonial system whose economy, functioning, and history had acquired the status of a virtual fact of nature" (Culture 134). My reading of Kipling's allegories, however, clearly attests to the special pertinence of Said's "virtual": the empire of Kipling's time is nearly, but not quite, a "fact of nature." In The Jungle Books, the repeated inscription of violence, as the seemingly inevitable final arbiter of imperial order, tears the fabric of allegory, revealing that the nature, the structures and meanings, of social, cultural, and political

relations within the empire are not constituted in advance, as reiterable features of given social "reality," as stable points of reference for the process of allegorical reframing and restaging. The salient presence of violence demonstrates that an entirely stable symbolic, intersubjective order of empire is still to be negotiated and suggests that such order may not be negotiable. The aggressive initiatives marking Mowgli's boyhood progress, his combative response to intransigent configurations of resistance, repeat, albeit in a different way, the enabling exclusion of Abdul Gafur from the magic moment in which the imperial subject attains clear, coherent recognition of itself. Such initiatives confirm the necessary exteriority of "In the Rukh" in relation to the narrative of Mowgli's boyhood: it is only in an idyllic narrative of utopian fulfillment—situated outside and beyond, both "before" and "after," the agonistic context of Mowgli's Bildung—that imperial subjectivity can be constituted within a stable, self-sustaining economy of recognition and identification.

The Jungle Books does not, however, represent Kipling's final word upon the "empire boy." The future of Kipling's "boy," which my two remaining chapters will examine, is elaborated in significantly more "realistic" contexts than those of the Mowgli saga. The fictive worlds of Stalky & Co. and Kim, while they are no more (and no less) "true" than the fabulous jungle realm, are distinguished by their more readily apparent historical referents—respectively, the United Services College at Westward Ho! and colonial India of the 1880s, particularly upper India and its frontier regions. (Discovering and restoring the occulted historical referents of the Mowgli tales has been, of course, a principal concern in the present chapter.) The boys of Stalky and Kim retain an allegorical significance, continue to represent, to "figure forth," utopian potentialities of imperial subjectivity, agency, and experience, but, at the same time, they are pressed closer to imperial actuality. The question of imperial violence, while not resolved, is certainly submitted to more systematic treatment. As my analysis will show, the schoolboy and the culturally hybrid imperial agent are made

to engage, more explicitly and more exactingly, with the "real business" of empire, with the practices and strategies of imperial acquisition and administration.

Stalky & Co.: Relocating and Dislocating the Empire and the "Empire Boy"

In "The Contents and Discontents of Kipling's Imperialism," Benita Parry ascribes to Kipling an unflagging "lifelong devotion to dominant beliefs and values" (52), asserting that "Kipling's writings moved empire from the margins of English fiction to its centre without interrogating the official metropolitan culture" (51). While Parry is able to make a quite compelling case by concentrating upon Kipling's "Indian" writings, yet significantly, I think, her article makes no mention at all of Stalky & Co., which explores imperial issues within the context of the "home front." As I observed in the preceding chapter, British imperial authority and presence are discreet—not to say insidious—in The Jungle Books. The motives, methods, and effects of British imperialism in India are neither posed nor interrogated, nor need they be, given that the British imperial intervention is rendered Indologically and allegorically. It is as if imperial values are inscribed in nature, always-already there in advance of any particular imperialist force or faction. However, the universalizing and naturalizing of imperialist drive and desire, already evident in The Jungle Books, does not necessarily serve, in all cases and contexts, the "dominant beliefs and values" of British imperial culture. Ideologies, one must recall, articulate themselves within an agonistic social and discursive context, each competing to assert its claims to relative power and dominance. While it may be true, as Althusser affirms, that "Ideology has no history" (159ff.), yet ideologies, in the plurality of their actuality, have histories, which are fraught with tensions arising from conflict and contradiction within the social arena. And indeed, as this chapter will show, the texts of Stalky & Co. both spur and support noteworthy developments of British popular culture, disruptively interrogating Britain's "official metropolitan culture," challenging and thus, to some degree, redefining

established understandings of its nature and its meaning.[1] By transporting the ("natural" and "universal") imperial urge from a mythic and exotic Indian jungle to the familiar setting of the metropolitan school, Kipling remakes a supposedly stable metropolitan centre as yet another imperial "combat zone," as yet another site of factional struggle within a delicate and shifting balance of the powers.[2]

---

[1]The argumentative line I propose here has been taken by noteworthy critics whose contributions, although different from that I intend to make, deserve mention. Martin Green (1979) characterizes the Kipling of the later Victorian and Edwardian periods "as celebrant of overt imperialism and subverter of literature-as-a-system" (264). Kipling, for Green, subverts the norms of British literary "high culture," by inscribing propaganda within its putatively disinterested esthetic, by forcing the repatriation of the "exiled" topics of empire and adventure. More recently, Stephen Arata (1993) has undertaken an extended revaluation of Kipling's cultural placement and impact, arguing that "The familiar image of Kipling as popular apologist for the dominant ideology has obscured our view of the turbulence which his initial appearance on the literary scene provoked" (8). To contest those critical voices that propose Kipling "as 'a spokesman for the age', a 'profoundly representative consciousness'," Arata links Kipling of the 90s with "the transgressive quality of fin-de-siècle writing, its calculated and often spectacular deviances" (7). Unlike Green's, Arata's critical perspective would seem to challenge my own. It surprises me, however, that Arata uses his scholarship to question Kipling's "representativeness" rather than to suggest, as I do in my "Introduction," the need for a broader, more inclusive understanding of that "representativeness." Kipling's work, I contend, manifests a pro-imperial "spokesmanship" that is deeply troubled by an awareness of the tensions and contradictions of his cultural and historical moment. The Kipling who inscribes traces of "decadent" skepticism and deviance upon tales of the empire does not cease, therefore, to be representative of his age, but rather manifests, in yet another instance, his responsiveness to various contemporary cultural issues and initiatives. I should add, finally, that Kipling's application of literary fin-de-siècliste, a very "metropolitan" esthetic, to narratives of the empire implies a breaking down of the centre/periphery model of the modern imperial world, a breaking down that this chapter very directly addresses, albeit in different terms.

[2]I borrow the phrase "combat zone" from Carole Scott, who, in "Kipling's Combat Zones," considers Stalky & Co. as an "otherworld" permeated by violence, a world "where the expected structural order is consistently sabotaged, and various codes of behavior vie with each other for supremacy" (63). Scott also pertinently notes "the absence of a clear dividing line between the 'Coll.' and the 'real world'" (65).

As Phillip Wegner has argued in a recent analysis of Kim, Kipling's writing, by the turn of the century, reveals its participation in "an emergent global logic" of British imperialism (132), "in a moment of discursive mutation, when the conceptualization of empire shifts from . . . a 'regional' to a 'global,' or systemic, perspective" (133). Citing J. A. Hobson's Imperialism: A Study (1902) as the most telling instance of a new envisioning of empire, Wegner stresses that "Hobson breaks with an older ethical critique that focused primarily on conditions at the imperial periphery, and argues that economic and political conditions at both the core and the periphery can only be understood when the two are treated as an inseparable whole" (133). In Stalky & Co. (which first appears in 1899, three years before the Hobson text) Kipling applies this logic of "an inseparable whole," focusing not upon the broader "economic and political conditions" but rather upon more palpable, more accessible, "everyday" formations of subjectivity, society, and culture. Kipling reshapes the school, a key site of the empire's socio-cultural core, in the image of the peripheries and, in so doing, subjects the public school topos and the figure of the schoolboy to a process of revaluation and transformation.

To speak of the school story (by the late nineteenth century a well-established, familiar and conventional genre) in terms of disruptive cultural and ideological revaluation may seem, on first consideration, somewhat extreme. However, as Isabel Quigly affirms, Stalky & Co.

> is the only school story . . . in which life at school is shown as directly parallel with life in the Empire; a training directly related to the life that lay ahead for many public schoolboys at the end of the nineteenth century, particularly boys from Kipling's school. . . . That school life was a narrow version of later life and that the patterns of prefect-rule were similar to those of the Empire was often implied, of course, but no book went as far as Stalky & Co. in making exact comparisons. (Heirs 116)

Here, I think, resides the generative core of the disruptive innovations of Kipling's text, which set it apart from its predecessors. As Ian Watson has argued, Tom Brown's Schooldays can and should be read as a key text furthering the mid-century English gentry's bid for dominance in the administration of the British empire. Hughes' seminal school story serves nonetheless to establish the public school as an insular, class-specific "little world," one that must be understood, first and foremost, on its own terms. Tom Brown, Terence Wright aptly observes, reflects "a moral earnestness in regard to youth which, already well established, intensified in the nineteenth century" (60). The text engages with "problems of authority, respect and discipline" and ultimately resolves them in ways that confirm the rightness of the school's hierarchical and authoritarian structure (61). It is the structural specificity of Hughes' school world that enables it to serve the empire: it inscribes attitudes, values, codes of conduct that can, ostensibly, be transported to the distant and distinct contexts of the empire. Kipling, however, as Martin Green asserts, "sets boyhood in an imaginative context radically unlike Tom Brown's Schooldays, not to mention Eric . . . . Kipling's heroes set themselves positively against traditional images of school piety and training—against house honour and cricket and so on" (274).[3] The "Coll." of Stalky is not an insular, relatively autonomous little world, susceptible to internal, self-referential definition, it is, as the boys' restless aggression repeatedly implies, a little empire that demands to be understood as such. For one like Kipling, writing in the historical context of the late nineteenth century, the "larger world" (to which fictive

---

[3]A more extensive discussion of Kipling's break with school-story traditions is to be found in Gilmour, who asserts that Stalky "subverted [the school-story] genre, and by doing so challenged a particular social and ethical code . . . which the school-story had enshrined and promoted since Tom Brown's Schooldays" (19-20). Gilmour focuses, first, upon the repudiation of the games ethic and its valorization of "fair play" and, subsequently, upon the stark absence of a morally progressive Bildungs in Kipling's school series.

school worlds invariably refer) can be coherently envisioned as the sphere of an increasingly global British imperial enterprise. Moreover, "the United Services College," writes Kipling in Something of Myself, "was in the nature of a company promoted by poor officers and the like for the cheap education of their sons . . . . It was largely a caste-school—some seventy-five per cent of us had been born outside England"—in camp or cantonment—"and hoped to follow their fathers in the Army" (16). Understandably, then, Kipling's fictive school not only reflects the larger world of empire, it participates fully within it; it is fully permeable to the practical and material, ethical and cultural influences of the imperial reality. With the advent of Stalky, the empire thoroughly informs and effectively transforms the world of school.

An appreciation of the cultural impact of Stalky & Co. requires a return to Kipling's own time of writing and, specifically, to the contemporary critical response his work provoked. Published in 1899, shortly after the first appearance of the Stalky stories in book form, Robert Buchanan's "The Voice of The Hooligan" registers, with unerring if often seemingly unconscious precision, the disruptive power of menace that Kipling's writing could bring to bear upon enshrined ideas and ideals of late Victorian, metropolitan Britain.[4] Having more the tone, rhetoric, and content of an impassioned political editorial than of a piece of literary criticism, Buchanan's article begins by ruminating darkly upon the present state of England and lamenting the dangerously unsettled state of Conservative national leadership. Undertaking, subsequently, an anxious and defensive advocacy of established (but not uncontested) notions of national culture, Buchanan denounces "the restless and uninstructed Hooliganism of the time"

---

[4]Buchanan, I should point out, is not alone in deploring Stalky. Isabel Quigly, in her "Introduction" to my volume, provides a "shortlist" of the book's more distinguished despisers, including George Sampson, H. G. Wells, A. C. Benson, and Somerset Maugham. Quigly does, however, give Buchanan pride of place as Kipling's and the book's "most virulent critic" (xiii).

(777) of which Kipling and his work are symptomatic—indeed, representative. Kipling gives voice to "The Hooligan," or, more precisely, to "Hooligan Imperialism" (776), that is, to the aggressive and pragmatic spirit of 1890s imperialism,[5] which, in Buchanan's view, is in part the cause and in part the effect of the contemporary corruption of the national character. Against "Kiplingism" (Buchanan's coinage) or "Hooligan Imperialism" Buchanan reasserts the earlier established (and more idealistic) ideology of the "civilizing mission." And, while Buchanan damns with scant praise the "Indian" stories (including The Jungle Books) and frankly deplores the Barrack-Room Ballads, he singles out Stalky & Co. as the text in which "the inmost springs of [Kipling's] inspiration" are definitively "laid bare."[6]

Certainly, in the context of this thesis, the logic orienting Buchanan's decision to foreground the Stalky series deserves some attention. According to Buchanan, "there is nothing which so clearly and absolutely represents the nature of a grown man's

---

[5]Buchanan condemns what he characterizes as a "new Ethos"—fully secular in its orientation, pragmatic, profit-motivated, militaristic, expansionist, populist—an imperialist ethos energized by "the worship of physical force and commercial success" (775) and enacted solely with a view to that which "is expedient, profitable, and certain of clamorous approval" (776). "Hooligan Imperialism" considers "that it is the sole mission of Anglo-Saxon England . . . to expand and extend its borders indefinitely, and . . . to conquer and inherit the Earth" (776).

[6]It is important to note that Buchanan's article inscribes itself within an intensely contested ideological arena. Buchanan's dissenting voice, which flies in the face of Kipling's contemporary lionization in both the political and cultural spheres, provokes various responses, most notably from Walter Besant and Clive Holland. Besant's "Is it the Voice of The Hooligan?" (also appearing in the Contemporary Review) calls Buchanan's ethics and motives into question and approvingly evaluates Kipling's artistry, morality, and politics. Holland, publishing in Literature, tends to steer a middle course between Buchanan and Besant, but finds in Kipling's work, and especially in Stalky & Co., a grievous lack of accuracy and verisimilitude. The Kipling debate apparently commanded considerable public attention, as is evidenced by the publication, in 1900, of The Voice of "The Hooligan": A Discussion of Kiplingism, which brings together in book form the disparate views of co-authors Buchanan and Besant.

intelligence as the manner in which he contemplates, looking backward, the feelings and aspirations of youthful days." Employing Goethe, Dickens, and Thackeray as his examples, he posits the figure of the boy as being both projective and reflective: upon the literary representative of his former self the writer projects the key values and most essential character of his mature self and, in so doing, reflects most clearly and incontestably the truest and (ideally) the best aspects of the mature self. "In Goethe's reminiscences of his childhood," for example, "we discover, faintly developing, all that was wisest and most beautiful in a soul which was distinguished . . . by an inherent love of gentleness and wisdom; the eager intelligence, the vision, the curiosity, are all there, in every thought and act of an extraordinary child" (774). Similarly and yet contrastingly, the degraded Hooliganism of Kipling, the adult writer, is most clearly delineated and detailed in his loosely autobiographical portrayals of the English schoolboy. And, given that "Kiplingism" clearly names a cultural (rather than merely individual) phenomenon, Buchanan's logic must be extended and generalized beyond the singular case: in its representations of boyhood a national culture writes its character most tellingly. This tacit assumption, investing and energizing myths of the "boy," opens the possibility of waggish and irreverent cultural terrorism such as that which Buchanan so abhors in Kipling's school tales.

As I have already implied, the unconscious of Buchanan's text is at least as interesting and revealing as its conscious, and it is in the unconscious process of his writing that Buchanan most clearly indicates the cause and character of his alarm. By attending to the letter of his text—more precisely, to what Lacan has famously characterized as "the agency of the letter in the unconscious"—one can detect a metonymic movement that manifests Buchanan's fear of colonial contamination within the metropolitan space, his anxious response to a return of the repressed, operating at the cultural level, an uncanny reinscription of the colonial periphery upon the forms and contents of the metropolitan centre.

Orienting Buchanan's enunciation are the key terms "Hooligan" and "Hooliganism," which demand close attention. These terms invoke images of corrupt, misguided, insubordinate, urban youth, together with a notion of delinquent confederacy: the hooligan is "a young street rough, a member of a street gang" (OED). An inflection of Irishness is immediately audible: "Hooligan" slurringly evokes such common Irish names as Hoolahan or Finnegan. And, indeed, The Oxford English Dictionary, in the article under "hooligan" (a word that first appears in print in 1898), notes that several sources "attribute it to a misunderstanding or perversion of Hooley or Hooley's gang"—"hooley" being an Irish word for "a noisy party, a spree." One learns, moreover, that "The name Hooligan figured in a music-hall song of the eighteen-nineties, which described the doings of a rowdy Irish family, and a comic Irish character of the name appeared in a series of adventures in Funny Folks." Discovering and establishing its significance within the context of the English and, specifically, the London press— the Daily News, Daily Telegraph, Daily Graphic, Westminster Gazette, Pall Mall Magazine (see OED citations)—"Hooligan" is an English word that implicitly ascribes Irish identity and agency to an English, urban and metropolitan, social problem. It names and condemns the Irish in England (and, more precisely, the displaced and disenfranchised Irish in the slums of London's East End). In the coinage of "hooligan," a new word at Buchanan's time of writing, certain key metropolitan issues—modern youth, urban criminality, civil disorder and unrest—are reorganized in relation to an implicit questioning of the Irish presence in England.

To evoke the Irish, the people of the oldest, the nearest, and, in the context of the later nineteenth century, the most obviously and obstreperously refractory of Britain's colonial possessions, is almost of necessity to evoke the broader reality of empire. The wide-spread contemporary "Hooliganism" of which Buchanan complains is of "Irish" and, speaking at once more broadly and more to the point, of colonial extraction—this last extension being justified by Buchanan's discourse of "savagery." Kipling, for

Buchanan, is noteworthy as a principal representative of a society in which "savage animalism" (783) is increasingly in evidence. Kipling's Ballads exemplify "horrible savagery" (779); his Stalky & Co. is a "savage caricature" (774) in which schoolboys are made to speak and act like "the savages of the London slums" (786). (These few examples do not exhaust Buchanan's stock of "savagery.") Now, one may speak of "Barbarism," as Buchanan does (774, 777, 780, 789), without looking beyond the European world and its history. A discourse of "savagery," however, adheres to a European perspective upon the history and, in many cases, upon the actuality of non-European (and, ultimately, colonial) societies. "Savagery," that is to say, is associated with the imperial peripheries, and the discourse of savagery, rather ironically, is one Buchanan "borrows" from the text of Stalky (as we shall shortly see). For Buchanan, "savagery" names a problem, a resistance, facing a "nobler Imperialism" (which Buchanan opposes to "Hooligan Imperialism" and which he unhesitatingly advocates), the imperialism of a "civilizing mission" to be actualized "in the federation of Great Britain and her colonies, and in the slow and sure spread of what is best and purest in our Civilization" (788). Yet it is not the peripheries, nor the "civilizing mission" abroad, but rather the present state of civilization in England generally and in London in particular that is the focus of Buchanan's concern. His is a discourse about contemporary "man" in "the great civic centers" of Europe (775), which orients itself, curiously, in terms of "retrogression" and "savagery," which seems to understand "Englishmen['s] . . . present wild orgy of militant savagery" (789) as a metropolitan form of "going native." The advocacy of cultural purity, progress, and civilization is undermined—one may say contaminated—by the repeated inscription of "Hooliganism," "Barbarism," and "savagery," terms that effectively remap the centre in terms of the periphery: (Irish) "Hooliganism" names a social problem whose (implicit) origins are alien and yet very close to home; "Hooliganism" recalls the "Barbarism" of an earlier, uncivilized Europe—"this also," as Conrad's Marlowe

observes, "has been one of the dark places of the earth" (29); "Hooliganism," once associated with "Barbarism" (and the attendant theme of "retrogression"), steers the discourse toward the "savagery" of the (temporally and spatially) distant colonial margins. The rhetorical and metonymic process of Buchanan's article thus resituates "savagery" (the problem confronting the "civilizing mission") in England, in the cultural site of the civilizing initiative; the distant, alien "savage" thus returns home.[7]

Kipling, as I have noted, is made to personify "all that is most retrograde and savage" in contemporary British society (777), and this character is most in evidence, according to Buchanan, in Kipling's portrayal of the schoolboy and the school world. A brief consideration of the opening of "In Ambush," the first story of the original Stalky & Co. of 1899, will already do much to reveal that Buchanan's apprehensions are not without substance:

> In summer all right-minded boys built huts in the furze-hill behind the College—little lairs whittled out of the heart of the prickly bushes, full of stumps, odd root-ends, and spikes, but, since they were strictly forbidden, palaces of delight. And for the fifth summer in succession, Stalky, M'Turk, and Beetle (this was before they reached the dignity of the study) had built, like beavers, a place of retreat and meditation, where they smoked. (29)

This passage, although tame enough in itself, does much to redefine the figure of the schoolboy. The early mention of "right-minded boys" initiates an on-going,

---

[7]Clearly, the overall movement of my "hooligan" argument posits a special significance and resonance for "Ireland" and "Irishness" within British imperial discourse: both are taken to evoke at once the imperial center and its peripheries. Such a stance is not, however, without precedent. Wegner notes Kim's double position as a subject to be located both in "the colonial periphery and the centre." Citing Fredric Jameson, Wegner goes on to observe that occupied Ireland represents "the unique national analogue of this double position" (154). Considering then the question of Kim's Irish identity, Wegner suggests that Kim may be "about" Ireland as much as it is "about" India: the text would thus perform "a utopian reconstruction of increasingly restive Irish populace; a neutralization of the Sinn Fein movement that had been founded only two years before the publication of Kim" (155).

increasingly corrosive parody of "Eric-ism," the sentimental and idealistic envisioning of the schoolboy commonly associated with the school novels of F. W. Farrar. In Kipling's text, of course, the right-minded boys are those who thwart authority and its rules in pursuit of their own pleasure. Indeed, indulgence in the realm of the "forbidden" is acknowledged as a principal source of "delight." Moreover, forbidden pleasures associate themselves not only with forbidden acts—like smoking—but also with forbidden space, with space that, in school jargon, is "out of bounds." As one learns, the threesome in question—two of whom significantly bear a nickname in lieu of the conventional patronym—have forged and established for themselves a private and personal space out of bounds long before attaining such a space—a study—within the school. Not at all a matter of occasional and sporadic lapse, being out of bounds is, for these boys, characteristic—a matter, like nicknaming, of time-honored, habitual practice.[8] These boys are marked, first and foremost, as adventurous and enterprising delinquents or, to use the language of the text, as "stalky" characters.

Delinquency, at least of the sort outlined in the present passage, is clearly a "right-minded" practice, operating under the aegis of the narrator's approval. It is, just as clearly, empire-building on a small scale: opportunistic and industrious, the boys venture out to discover and appropriate alien space as their own, submitting untamed, virgin land—the "furze-hill"—to the rule of domestication and utility. Yet if "right-minded" (that is, delinquent) boys appear here in the guise of "little imperialists," they also appear (to borrow Buchanan's vocabulary) as "little savages": their "palaces of delight" are decidedly primitive structures, "huts" or "little lairs," barely more hospitable than the original landscape—not radical reconstructions, not decisive

---

[8]"Stalky," the first story of The Complete Stalky & Co. of 1929, also situates the bulk of its action out of bounds. The reader of the 1929 Stalky, having perused the volume's first two stories, "Stalky" and "In Ambush," has spent a great deal of time following out-of-bounds shenanigans and very little time in the bounds of the school space.

transformations of that landscape, but mere modifications "full of stumps, odd root-ends, and spikes." Evidently, the wild space of the furze, which will later be characterized, not so surprisingly, as "jungle" (33), imposes itself upon the boys as much as they impose themselves upon it.

The opening paragraph of "In Ambush" offers in little a demonstration of the general textual strategy of Stalky & Co. The parodic subversion of the conventional codes informing fictions of the school occurs simultaneously with the production of alternative, delinquent codes. The contents of such familiar topics as "character" and the "public-school ethos" are rewritten, the process and the purpose of schooling implicitly subjected to revaluation. Already apparent, too, is the importance of space—space to be discovered, appropriated, exploited, but also to be appreciated, as it were, on its own terms. The characters dominate space, but, at the same time, discover themselves in creative relation with it. As is already liminally evident, space impacts upon character in such a way as to create indeterminacies and ambivalences in the coding of identities—are the boys in the furze "little imperialists" or "little savages" or both at once?[9]

Throughout the several texts of Stalky & Co., the subversion of the school, as a stable and conventional textual domain, as a symbolically coherent "little world," ordered and hierarchized under constituted systems of authority, is closely linked to a complex—and equally subversive—thematics of space. Certainly, subversion of symbolic order at times operates independently from spatial considerations. Nicknaming, one soon learns, is a generalized practice that blithely irreverent, "right-minded" boys apply to the masters as well as to themselves. In "In Ambush" alone,

---

[9]Although he does not squarely confront the issues I raise here, Green remarks upon the repeated inscription of "'savage' and 'primitivist' perspectives" in Kipling's manual of imperial education and supports the observation with an extended catalogue of textual citations (273-74).

the stalky trio refer to their house-master and principal adversary, Prout, by a variety of unauthorized names, beginning with "Hoofer"—"Hoof" for short —(in recognition of the master's remarkably large feet) and moving through such playful derivations as "Heffy," "Heffles," "Hoophats," and "Hefflelinga." Similarly pertinent, here, is the fragmented, mock-heroic deployment of Latin, as manifested in "Hefflelinga" and "Foxibus" (for "Foxy," the school Sergeant), or in Stalky's description of his encounter with the master Hartopp, an avid naturalist, whom he finds "destricto ense—wavin' a butterfly-net" (30). Without exhausting the ample stock of linguistic insubordination Kipling's text provides, one can see that language is being used to signal and (preliminarily) to enact a levelling of school hierarchy. At least from the boys' perspective, boy and master confront each other on a more or less equal footing. The school, as becomes increasingly clear, is divided into competing camps, all of them engaged in the struggle to obtain or retain degrees of dominance. And of paramount importance in this struggle are the control and manipulation of spatial relations, the perceiving and the playing of spatial advantages. Subversive language practices, initially functioning more or less independently and setting the stage for free competition amongst opponents, subsequently operate in tandem with the schoolboys' efforts to establish, defend and extend their imperium. And it is in situations oriented in terms of competition for space that subversion of conventional discursive codes is most obvious and most corrosive.

"In Ambush" initiates the struggle for spatial dominance as Prout, assisted by the Sergeant, "take[s] the field," leaving the tell-tale "track of his pugs" writ large upon the floor of the lair (29). "Pugs," derived "from the Hindustani word 'pag', the track of an animal" (298n), marks the first step of Prout's degeneration, which is more precisely but scarcely more flatteringly rendered when Stalky discovers the offending prints: "Crusoe, at the sight of the foot-print," one learns, "did not act more swiftly than Stalky" (29). Prout, who had "taken the field," invested with the dubious dignity

of a military adversary, is placed in association, first, with brute beasts and then, more specifically, with Defoe's Carib cannibals. He is rhetorically repositioned as a savage intruder whose tactical sophistication is very much open to question. (The boys, following the narrator's lead, will later characterize the Sergeant as "a giddy Chingangook" [39].) Prout, a master, when once drawn into the contest for space, is accorded no more pride of place than the Devonshire farmers of "Stalky," who, in a parallel manner, are pictured during a moment of "skirmishing" as "natives, brandishing their weapons" (15). The master's discovery of the out-of-bounds haven is figured as another sort of colonial encounter that carries with it the implied possibility of aggression and hostility.

As the narrative develops, the association of rhetorical and expansionist maneuvers proceeds apace, as does the association of these maneuvers with imperial practices and contexts. To counter Prout's first bumbling initiative, Stalky makes perverse use of school codes, enlisting himself and his cohorts with the school's Natural History Society, a club whose members are granted a relatively free exploration of the school environs. Bearing as camouflage, a botany case, a geological hammer, and a butterfly-net (all three items stolen from fags), the threesome sets out upon an authorized search for new smoking grounds and find an agreeable local upon the private estate of Dabney, a retired colonel. Here again, the interlinkage of language practice and territorial maneuver is evident, as M'Turk, "viceroy of four thousand naked acres, only son of a three-hundred-year-old [Irish] house," slips into the dialect of the Irish gentry and winningly addresses the Colonel "as one gentleman to another": "It was the landed man speaking to his equal—deep calling to deep—and the old gentleman acknowledged the cry" (35). The erstwhile trespassers are granted occasional access to the estate, which therefore falls within their bounds as "lawful Bug-hunters." Thus established in a position that is "legally unassailable," the boys prepare for the nonetheless inevitable assault of school authorities by exploring the wilds of the estate "with the stealth of

Red Indians and the accuracy of burglars" (41) and by winning the sympathies of Dabney's keeper, with whom Stalky familiarly converses in "the broad Devon that [is] the boy's langue de guerre" (42). Stalky and company are now "in ambush," ready to "entrap the alien at the proper time" (46). Allowing themselves to be followed by their too ardent overseers, the boys lure the Sergeant, Prout, and King (who by now has joined the fray) onto the estate, skillfully elude capture, and deliver their pursuers into the hands of the keeper.

The climactic moment of the narrative intrigue registers victory (and a corresponding defeat) by bringing to fulfillment a series of discursive and tactical maneuvers. Speaking in Devonshire accents, Stalky excites and orients the keeper's suspicions (by suggesting that the noisy but as yet unseen trespassers must be "poachers simly") and thus ensures that the enemy threesome will be brought before Dabney. After yielding some pleasure to hidden listeners, the absurd poaching charge is dropped. Dabney, however, alluding repeatedly to his numerous and forbidding "notice-boards," stands firm on the charge of trespassing. Prout, who has yet to learn that language is a weapon to be deployed with due attention to time and place, defends himself by recourse to a conventional formula of the school code: "I stand in loco parentis" (44). The phrase "in loco parentis" in itself invokes the power of place and raises a question, at least potentially, about standing in a place that is not one's own. Prout, in the more secure context of the school, has previously put the phrase to the boys, disgusting them and provoking them to execute their "draw." The re-enunciation of "in loco parentis" in an out-of-bounds context is the prelude to a fall, which is not long in coming. Dabney responds with a question, parodically posed in schoolish Latin: "'Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?' If the masters trespass, how can we blame the boys?" (45). The answer to Dabney's question is obvious enough (though perhaps not to him): the overseers, the guardians, are watched, are controlled, by their wards—by the boys. Dabney's gloss, moreover, invests the word "trespass" with the fullness of

its moral and legal implications. Who, indeed, may be said to transgress and offend in a fictive world in which everyone, patently, is playing the same game, in which boys and masters engage in a struggle to dominate and control various spaces, to win and exercise power over the opposing faction? Both sides concoct strategies, undertake initiatives and counter-initiatives, attempt (with greater or lesser skill and success) to discover and develop rhetorical and territorial advantages. To raise the moral and legal question of "trespass" is, most cogently, to point up the effective absence of ethics and law as questions, as considerations. Making and maintaining a moral distinction between authority and delinquency becomes decidedly difficult when the formal and operative characteristics of the one are remarkably similar to those of the other. "Moral authority" is precisely what fails the masters in their time of need. And, in fact, it is only too clear that authority and, by implication, power are entirely situational and contextual, subject to fluctuation and change as conditions and positions change. School conflicts develop and resolve themselves as do imperial conflicts; the same factors determine success or failure. As the Sergeant, a veteran of the Indian Mutiny,[10] correctly concludes, "I might ha' known when they led me on so that they 'eld the inner line of communications" (52). At school and in the empire, the same "rules of thumb" apply.[11]

---

[10]The characterization of the Sergeant represents a key site of the Mutiny's inscription in Stalky. Foxy, the Mutiny veteran who will later fulfill the role of drill-master of the cadet-corps, codes school struggles not simply as imperial contests but, much more specifically, as displaced re-enactments of the insurgency and counter-insurgency of 1857-58. The presentation of the boys as Orientalized insurgents in part one of "Slaves of the Lamp" similarly recalls the Mutiny even as it foretells future careers in the Indian empire.

[11]My indebtedness to the scholarship of Michel Foucault is becoming increasingly evident as my argument progresses. Certainly, my willingness to consider power as a decisive factor in the determination of social relations derives as much from the reading of Foucault as from the reading of Kipling. I have also tacitly subscribed to Foucault's notion of discourse as a means and an end of social struggle, his sense that one seeks

"In Ambush," lacking as it does any flamboyantly violent, destructive, or distasteful episodes, is not one of the two stories ("Slaves of the Lamp, Part I" and "An Unsavoury Interlude") Buchanan singles out for vituperative critique. This tamer story merits extended consideration because it displays unambiguously if somewhat mutedly the governing textual logic of the Stalky series, an imperial logic that will occasion violence and destruction but does not, in every case, require them.

Even a brief consideration of a few of the Stalky stories reveals the compositional unity and integrity of the series. "Stalky," recounting one confrontation of "[t]hree years' skirmishing," pits the tactical abilities of the wayward schoolboy against the "natives" of Devonshire, "a hard and unsympathetic peasantry" (17). Imperial language and practice are very much in evidence, as emphasis is placed upon such matters as the proper deployment of "pickets" (13) and the full knowledge of "the lie of the country" (14). "In Ambush," as I have shown, draws the masters into an essentially similar imperial game. "The Impressionists," which never strays from the space and language of the school, remains true nonetheless to the previously established textual strategy: on suspicion of extreme and highly specialized practices of cribbing, Stalky and company are turned out of their study; Beetle practises upon the high-minded house-master, employing the tried-and-true rhetorical techniques of "suppressio veri" and "suggestio falsi" to cast doubt upon the "character" of the house; the master, thus "drawn," instigates an investigation whose tentative first initiatives receive rhetorical prodding and spurring from the threesome, now at large in the house;

---

through speech to gain power and through power to gain speech (see notably The Discourse on Language). Such notions are not foreign to the Kipling of Stalky or of Kim. Most crucially, my attention to the politics of the gaze (who sees whom, and in what circumstances?) and of space management derives from Foucault's study of "the disciplines" (see, in particular, Discipline and Punish). To avoid redundancy, however, I have chosen not to undertake an explicitly, rigorously Foucauldian reading here. Such a reading is included in my analysis of Kim, a text that rewards the application of Foucault's theory and critical practice still more richly than Stalky.

inquisitorial chaos ensues; the house-master, seeing the need for desperate measures, returns the exiles to their study. Moving on to the more "distasteful" stories, one discovers the same underlying narrative motifs and structures. In "An Unsavoury Interlude" Beetle undertakes a close study of architecture, a spatial discipline entailing analytical visualization, to discover the optimal strategic placement of a dead cat, which has been recruited to "stink out" enemy houses. The cat's vanguard efforts receive due support from the rear-guard, as Stalky and company treat their adversaries to double portions of a discourse of hygiene, an "offensive" discourse previously directed against the threesome. Here, again, the location of speech is as important as its contents: from the railings above the Common-room (where the masters of the offending houses are known to be gathered), the boys harangue their unfortunate school-fellows, parodying—seriatim and not at all privatim—the speaking styles of the masters. "The Moral Reformers" provides yet another example of the underlying coherence of the Stalky series: playing upon their adversaries' taste for cruelty, Stalky and company lure two upper-form bullies into their study and, exploiting the spatial advantage thus gained, submit them to a humiliating session of physical and rhetorical torture.

It is evident, then, without further multiplying textual examples, that Stalky & Co. manifests certain consistencies of method and, by implication, of purpose, which indicate the inadequacy of Buchanan's appraisal. To receive the work merely as symptomatic of the degeneration of a cultural project, as a retrogression from a certain level of civil and cultural achievement, is to ignore its articulation of an alternative and contestatory cultural project, one that entails a re-envisioning of the nature and the meaning of the school and the empire, the schoolboy and the imperial subject. What Kipling puts forward is quite simply an imperialist rendering of a time-honored, philosophical adage—"Everything is in everything." Kipling's empire is not divided between a stable centre and a changeful periphery, but is rather one great, intimately interconnected assembly, a relatively seamless whole: the "savage" periphery is in the

"civilized" centre (and vice versa); the empire, in all its various and diverse manifestations, is here in the school, just as the school (as represented by its graduates) is out there in the empire. As Buchanan revealingly acknowledges, "This trio [Stalky, M'Turk, and Beetle] are leagued for purposes of offence and defence against their comrades . . . ; they join in no honest play or manly sports, they lounge about, they drink, they smoke, they curse and swear, not like boys at all, but like hideous little men" (785, my emphasis). Within the school context, Stalky and company reproduce, with fair precision, that earlier trio of imperial ne'er-do-wells, Mulvaney and company, the "Soldiers Three." Whether or not one considers them "hideous," Kipling's schoolboy and his imperial soldier are remarkably alike.[12] As Kipling's occasional references to their genealogy and heritage recall, the boys of Westward Ho! college are sons of the empire. They do, and will do, no more, and no less, than their predecessors are doing and have done within British imperialism's broader sphere.

The specular relation between the microcosmic school and the macrocosmic empire is most clearly rendered in "Slaves of the Lamp," a story in two parts, each complete in itself, yet standing in specular relation to the other whose full significance it verifies and completes. What needs to be emphasized, here, is this relation of mutual confirmation, which, despite the temporal spacing that constitutes an "earlier" and a "later," is not one of cause and effect. Stalky, the roguish schoolboy, elucidates and, in a certain sense, explains the character of Stalky, the unconventional imperial tactician; yet so also does this adult officer elucidate and explain the character and actions of the boy. Stalky's two worlds, the school and the empire, are really one world, and it is not surprising therefore that the methods and actions of schoolboy and imperial officer are essentially the same.

---

[12]Robert Moss goes so far as to argue that "Soldier's Three was the author's first full-length work on boyhood, though [Kipling] would not have designated it that way" (34).

As Harold Nicolson, looking back from the perspective of the 1930s, remarks, "the public schools in the pre-war period were designed to provide a large number of young men fitted for the conquest, administration and retention of a vast Oriental Empire" (qtd. in Quigly, Heirs 261). The imperial implications of "Slaves of the Lamp, Part I" are thus immediately and aptly marked by the Orientalist title. The story's first paragraph situates the school world within the broader context of the imperial Imaginary, as Stalky and company, now part of "the 'Alladin' company," rehearse an Orientalist pantomime, wear Orientalist costumes, answer to character names taken from the "Arabian Nights." The libretto they work with, moreover, has been "rewritten and filled with local allusions" (54) and thus stages the school world in intimate relation with Orientalist fantasy.[13]

Significantly, Stalky, the Slave of the Lamp, remains in costume throughout the duration of the maneuver he and his cohorts eventually undertake against house-master King. The trio's call-to-arms resonates with imperial themes, as the cry of "King! War!" is immediately followed by a noteworthy choice of weapons: "a small West-African war-drum, a gift to M'Turk from a naval uncle," will be used to provoke the enemy (60). The maneuver that follows upon the declaration of war sketches quite precisely the pattern of the future initiatives of Stalky's imperial career. Stalky, unseen, provokes a hostile confrontation between King and Rabbits-Eggs, a drunken local. King is thus drawn out of position, obliged to abandon his study, which Beetle vandalizes in his absence.

In "Slaves of the Lamp, Part II" a reunion of alumni brings together the former players of an Orientalist pageant, who appear now as "real-life" actors whose careers

---

[13]Here and in my subsequent discussion of Kim, the use of the term "Orientalist" is informed by Saidian scholarship. In his Orientalism, Said effectively deconstructs Orientalism as a scholarly discipline, revealing that the Orientalist perspective is, more accurately, a site of collective fantasy created and sustained by the establishment of Western empires.

have involved them in the real business of building and maintaining an Oriental empire: erstwhile Alladins and Abanazars appear now as captains of Native Infantry, as functionaries of the Indian Political Service and the Telegraph Department. A "Burmese gong," reminiscent of the earlier African war-drum, aptly heralds the serving of "a dinner from the Arabian Nights." The conversation, like the libretto of the earlier pantomime, proves to be a promiscuous mixture of the local and the far-flung, of school reminiscences and the news of empire—"a cheerful babel of matters personal, provincial, and imperial, pieces of old call-over lists, and new policies" (280).

Stalky, ever busy with the affairs of empire, is the only absent member of the original "Alladin company." He establishes presence, however, by becoming the principal topic of discussion. Formerly a schoolboy mischief-maker in Orientalist garb, Stalky remains true to this earlier incarnation, figuring now as the unconventional commander of a Sikh detachment, one who lives on familiar terms with his men, speaking their tongue, eating, sleeping, even praying with them: "Stalky," one speaker avers, "is a Sikh" (283). Similarly, the maneuver of "Part II," which is narrated in detail, is once again a stalky initiative and parallels tactically the maneuver of "Part I." Hemmed in by the forces of two Afghan tribes combined in an unstable alliance, Stalky penetrates unseen behind enemy lines and, making good use of suggestio falsi, succeeds in turning one tribe against the other: like King and Rabbits-Eggs before them, Malôt and Khye-keen, each convinced of the other's perfidy, turn upon each other, leaving to Stalky and his band the easy task of collecting together, as prisoners, the battered and confused survivors of the clash.

Accounting for the mutual mirroring of the "Slaves" stories requires that one understand that the empire of Stalky & Co. has no exterior. Stalky does not move out of the school and into a new and different space of empire; he moves rather from one imperial site to another. Unlike Harry East of Tom Brown's Schooldays, who

ostensibly learns in school a class-specific public-school ethos that will later orient his action within the distinct context of the Indian empire, Stalky begins and ends his career as a character in the imperial context, engaged in imperial practice. Stalky is always-already involved in the empire; he has no other place or situation, nor, for that matter, has any other character of Stalky & Co. As the Kipling narrator makes clear, one should not insist too much upon the uniqueness of Stalky and his school experience: "India's full of Stalkies—Cheltenham and Haileybury and Marlborough chaps—that we don't know anything about . . ." (296).[14]

Faced with this assertion of the generalized "stalkiness" of the British imperial project, one must wonder if there is in Stalky & Co. some key figure whose role it would be to regiment and contain the text's fractious energies, the endlessly experimented play of language, the continual redistribution of powers and redeployment of disciplined modes of action. One must ask, is there some embodiment of law, of lawful authority, to fix and stabilize meanings, to orient and organize the operations of the disciplines?

Modelled loosely upon Cormell Price, to whose memory Stalky & Co. is dedicated, the Head is a charismatic character commanding the apparently unflagging respect and admiration of his charges. If he has not quite the godlike status of the all-seeing, all-knowing Doctor of Tom Brown's Schooldays, yet he invariably sees through the schoolboy antics that befuddle even the shrewdest of the house-masters. It would be tempting, therefore, to find in Headmaster Bates a figure upholding and asserting the rule of law—a figure, like Hughes' Arnold, who stands as "the final arbiter . . . the final moral norm" (Wright 61)—were it not for the fact that Bates is so clearly a

---

[14]The question remains as to just how far one should generalize from Kipling's "Coll." Wegner, for one, would seem to favor the broadest possible generalization: following Hobson, he observes that, by the end of the nineteenth century, "nearly every social space outside the imperial network had disappeared" (135).

rhetorician and a disciplinarian, who is arbitrary, indeed almost wanton, in his fulfillment of both roles. The Head confronts the school world on its own terms. He does not represent an alternative, higher, lawful code opposed to the everyday delinquent practices of school life. On the contrary, he commands the schoolboy's admiration because he participates in the power-games of the school and does so with unequalled refinement and sophistication.

"The Impressionists" provides perhaps the best example of the Head in action. Confronted by Stalky and company, yet again fallen into error, the Head demonstrates that he is indeed the subtlest of the beasts of the school. He opens the meeting by tacitly acknowledging and accepting that schoolboy mischief, kept within certain limits, has its place in the school: "House-masters aren't here to be bothered by boys more than is necessary"; that is, the masters <u>are</u> here to be "bothered" by boys, but not more than is necessary. The limits, however, as the Head makes clear, have nothing to do with moral imperatives or codes of behavior. In fact, the Head undertakes to condemn and punish the unbridled pursuit of private vendettas by pursuing a private vendetta. Justifying the exertion of his power to punish, the master protests no higher goal than self-interest: "You are bothering <u>me</u>. That is a serious offence. . . . Well, now, I purpose to bother you, on personal and private grounds, because you have broken into my time" (116). First deploring the rod as inappropriate for older boys, Bates then proposes still more odious exactions and thus moves his victims to plead in favor of a caning. Obligingly, he proceeds with the preferred punishment, offering at the same time an instructive discourse, which is broken yet punctuated by strokes of the rod, a discourse that underlines the irresponsibly authoritarian and abusive aspects of the situation, yet colors these aspects with ironic cajolery and even a trace of fond nostalgia:

> "Among the—lower classes this would lay me open to the charge of—assault. You should be more grateful of your—privileges than you are. There is a limit—one finds it by experience, Beetle--beyond which it is never safe to pursue private vendettas, because—don't move—sooner or later one comes—into collision with the—higher authority, who has studied the animal. Et ego—M'Turk, please—in Arcadia vixi. There's a certain flagrant injustice about this that ought to appeal to—your temperament." (117)

In this scene, as in others, the Head out-stalks the stalky schoolboy. His actions tend to confirm rather than correct the usual functioning of the school world, the everyday Hobbesian war of all against all. The Head has not, of course, given over the task of character-building. He simply envisions the task in a different way. A realist within a militant and pragmatic social order (the very image, in little, of the social order that Buchanan idealistically abhors), "Bates Sahib" tacitly acknowledges that the boy must learn his imperial lessons, must learn to be canny, aggressive yet adaptable, refractory yet malleable. The Headmaster, moreover, demonstrates by his own example that—at least when it comes to "stalkiness"—there is always more to learn.[15]

Unlike Hughes' Doctor, then, Kipling's Head does not function as the embodiment of law and its sanctioning power, as the representative of an impersonal, prescriptive code to whose authority all subjects must finally conform. Ultimately, there is no law

---

[15]The core of my argumentation, here, is by no means new. As Robin Gilmour recalls, early responses to Stalky include H. G. Wells' perspicacious denunciation of "a tacit conspiracy between the law and illegal violence" in Kipling's school world (qtd. in Gilmour 30). Assuming a very similar critical stance, Martin Green affirms, "The book's central paradox, around which the others are organized, is that of authority. . . . The paradox is mediated through the mechanism of the Headmaster; he represents true authority, which the boys recognize, and he in effect legitimizes their rebellion against the untrue authority of the other masters. . . . What this does is to give irony a role within a system of piety — to give rebellion a role within a system of authority" (274-75). The point I wish to stress, however, is that the Head's enactment of authority effectively undermines his (traditional and expected) role as the representative of a lawful limit. The Head ironizes "piety" and the law by placing himself outside and beyond their system, confirms his authority by placing himself and the trio of charismatic rebels in a "privileged" position above that system.

in the school-empire of Stalky & Co., no constraining code whose inscription precedes its enactment as social practice. A pre-existing rule of the Symbolic, which situates stable, unified identities in defined relation, which fixes meanings and values, is undermined. A new, alternative code is never clearly established. Kipling's empire unfolds upon the suspension of the law and the subversion of established codes; it is a world in which self-interested, self-oriented practices develop as if spontaneously in response to circumstances and situations, in which imperial practices are justified, if at all, only by reference to the play of power, pleasure, and desire.

"The shift from a regional to a global model of imperialism," Wegner remarks, "produces its own cognitive dilemmas—for how does any one individual grasp and finally represent this new situation?" (135). The resolution of this question, for Kipling as for Stalky, involves reading the inscription of the whole in each of its parts, the inscription of the global reality of empire in each of its regional or local manifestations. As Wegner rightly avers, neither "the global empire's massive structure" nor its "pervasive hegemonic force" can be grasped from a single perspective; both lie "beyond the cognitive horizons of any individual agent" (136-38). What is required, then, is the forging of a subjectivity capable of effectively inhabiting in turn each of the empire's various spaces, by seeing the similarities and continuities that (ostensibly) reside beneath the surface of differences, by reading each new, unfamiliar space or situation as an analogue of a familiar one, and by uniformly applying pre-established modes of perception and action. Faced with an empire whose Symbolic dimension (as a global, political and economic, cultural and discursive system) is beyond the ken of any individual, one shifts perspective from the macrological to the micrological, from the macrocosmic to the microcosmic. One adopts, that is, an Imaginary orientation, subdividing the empire into manageable "little worlds" that the individual can conceivably apprehend and organize on his own terms,

in meaningful, coherent relation with his individual perspectives, orientations, initiatives--his "selfhood."

Eschewing extensive invocation of the law and its constraints, Stalky & Co. distinguishes itself sharply from the earlier Jungle Books. Stalky, however, like Mowgli before him, is schooled to fulfill the role of hero of the imperial Imaginary, as becomes clear when the middle-aged M'Turk offers the final vision of Stalky in India, a vision that strikingly resembles Gisborne's glimpse of Mowgli in "In the Rukh." Here again, in the final passages of "Slaves of the Lamp, Part II," one finds the same iconographic treatment, which seats the garlanded hero, becalmed and bemused by the fullness of his pleasure and power, in the centre of the charmed circle of the Imaginary order: "I was in camp in the Jullunder doab," M'Turk relates,

> and stumbled slap on Stalky in a Sikh village; sitting on the one chair of state with half the population grovellin' before him, a dozen Sikh babies on his knees, an old harridan clappin' him on the shoulder, and a garland o' flowers round his neck. 'Told me he was recruitin'. (296)

In keeping with his informal apotheosis, Stalky has been inadvertently renamed for the Muslim holy book: slightly but significantly deformed in the mouths of the Sikhs, "Corkran Sahib" becomes "Koran Sahib." Stalky is thus made to embody the Word, to make it flesh, to become for his Sikhs a personal, accessible, Imaginary manifestation of imperial authority and, at the same time, a site of symbolic identification with the British empire.[16]

---

[16]Stalky's symbolic power and significance in the Sikh community is tellingly confirmed by the fact that his name can be deployed in lieu of the more conventional signs that order and facilitate symbolic, intersubjective exchange. Affiliation with Stalky, the right to use his name, is as good as money: concluding his anecdotal narrative, M'Turk relates, "'Told me . . . that if I wanted any supplies I'd better say I was Koran Sahib's bhai [brother]; and I did, and the Sikhs wouldn't take my money" (296).

Stalky's apotheosis distinguishes itself from Mowgli's by the inclusion within its economy of historically referential colonial subjects: the moment of magical, mutual recognition binding together Mowgli and Gisborne occurs in the presence of the wolf-"retainers," but only upon the withdrawal of both Abdul Gafur and his daughter, Mowgli's bride; whereas, Stalky's moment of glory occurs in the midst of "his" Sikhs. The Sikhs, however, function (like the wolf-brethren) exclusively as objects of Imaginary identification—"Stalky is a Sikh"—and not as the (collective) site of symbolic identification. Stalky, in whom the imperial officer and the liminal boy come together, finds his point of symbolic identification in the admiring gaze of M'Turk, school-fellow and fellow representative of empire: Stalky appears "likeable" to himself, worthy of esteem, not in the eyes of his Sikhs, but in the eyes of M'Turk, who marvels at the sight of Stalky among "his" Sikhs. The colonial subject's inclusion in the economy of identification is only partial: the Sikhs are not there to see (an action entailing a certain degree of autonomy and agency) but to be seen, to be the "scene" of a staging of the imperial subject.

What is most striking in Stalky's last scene is its entirely resolved, pacified quality. The utter absence of antagonism, of disparate and divided interests, sets it at odds with the general rule of the text. Having established the school as a site of on-going imperial conflict, Kipling shifts the action to an actual site of imperial enterprise, only to find that here, in the empire, there is ultimately no conflict: Stalky, his battles fought and won, enjoys an uncontested mastery (something his own masters never enjoyed); the subjects under authority, the colonial subjects, do not resist, do not strive to assert themsleves in opposition to constituted authority and its representatives. Establishing a definitive difference between Stalky and the Sikhs clearly draws upon a preceding production of agency exclusively as active, rebellious resistance: in Stalky & Co., schoolboy agency is resistance; the Sikhs do not resist. Here resides a significant difference between the boy and the colonial subject, which the text

implicitly posits and upon which its precarious coherence depends. "[A]s though answering a question no one had asked," Hartopp reflects upon rebellious schoolboy antics by observing, "It's not brutality. . . . It's boy; only boy" (93). Cunning resistance and creative self-assertion in rebellion are ascribed to the "boy" as natural characteristics, as aspects of his "boyishness," and this ascription "goes without saying"—is not, must not, be questioned. The same logic does not apply, however, to the colonial subject. And, of course, to consider the possibility of such an application would be, once again, "answering a question no one had asked."

Plucky British boys are, then, significantly different from Indian colonials. Kipling, at the crucial moment of resolution, "draws the color line"—to use S. P. Mohanty's phrase. But, in so doing he inscribes a contradiction: the wily insubordination of the schoolboy, which is consistently associated with the colonial world and the colonial subject, becomes finally the very feature that distinguishes the enduringly boyish British officer from the Indian colonials of his entourage. One must note, moreover, that "the color line" is drawn upon unsteady ground: the schoolboy turned imperial officer is no longer readily recognizable as "British"; "Stalky is a Sikh." Implicitly, Stalky dominates Indian colonials by first establishing a marked degree of socio-cultural commonality with them. Stalky's special authority, like that of the lupine Mowgli among his wolf-"retainers," depends in large part upon his being first among brothers.

The final scenes of "Slaves" thus raise the question of cultural hybridization. The final envisioning of Stalky manifests the hybridization of the sign that emerges between opposed cultures, the production of a contingent sign "in-between the colonizer and the colonized" (Bhabha, Location 206). Cannot one discern in the final figuring of Stalky as Sikh something akin to Bhabha's chapati—"a heterogeneous, hybrid sign" (207) produced in the contingent negotiations of cultural difference? Reconsidering M'Turk's comment—"'Told me he was recruitin'"—is it not also true that Stalky has

been, is being, "recruited"? Stalky's transfiguration as Sikh articulates "the contingent process of the inside [in this case, British imperial subjectivity and culture] turning into the outside [colonial Indian subjectivity and culture] and producing another hybrid site or sign" (Bhabha 207). Sikh culture has, at least partially, written itself upon Stalky, thus fulfilling a preceding textual process that writes the various signs of colonial subjectivity upon the British schoolboy, thus registering and implicitly acknowledging an "Other" agency in the production of a hybridized imperial subject. As Bhabha affirms, to locate and to read the hybrid signs produced by cross-cultural colonial confrontations is to undermine "the binary opposition of racial and cultural groups . . . as homogeneous polarized political consciousnesses" (207). Despite its attempt to essentialize cultural difference, Stalky ultimately confirms the breakdown of imperialism's centre/periphery paradigm. Despite its attempt to represent agency exclusively as rebel resistance and, on that basis, to deny agency to the "pacified" colonial subaltern, the text also tacitly ascribes a form of agency to the colonized Sikhs. The Stalky difference is not, in the end, an essentially British, metropolitan trait but an effect of hybridization in the contact zone.

Kipling's tale of an Imaginary hero bustling about in an Imaginary school-empire effectively challenges, as I have shown, received notions of the British empire, abandoning the legitimizing myth of "the civilizing mission," undermining, to a significant degree, the distinctions dividing the centre from the periphery. Kipling generalizes the imperial reality to include the world of school and in so doing splits the identity of the schoolboy, making of him a little imperialist and a little savage, an agent and a subject of imperial authority. To mend or "suture" the split identity of the imperial schoolboy, however, Kipling must produce the "boy" as a hybridized imperial subject. Clearly, Stalky & Co. manifests what Parry finds to be a general (if often more implicit) characteristic of Kipling's fiction: the school tales represent "the construction of an identity that is dependent on the conquest of another's self"

("Contents" 51). Yet, at the same time, the construction of an imperial identity, in Stalky's world, is not simply a unilateral conquest but also, more notably, a negotiation of effects of hybridization in the highly contingent space of colonial encounter.

One final question, then, must be posed in relation to this text: does Kipling's revaluation of the imperial reality, of the culture and the subjects it produces, serve the imperialist project? If it serves, I would conclude, it does so very ambivalently. To borrow the evaluation Bhabha applies to the case of Conrad, Kipling "(be)sets the boundary between the colony and the metropolis" (Location 213), thus problematizing the representation of "the global link between colony and metropolis, so central to the ideology of imperialism" (212). Kipling's Stalky implicitly acknowledges that management of identities is tied up with the management of space, segregation of identities with the segregation of spaces. However, within this text, the colonial peripheries—the spaces and cultures of the colonial Other—are not kept distinct and separate from the metropolitan centre—the space and culture of the imperial Subject. Kipling's schoolboy thus emerges not as the unified subject of a self-sovereign imperial culture, but rather as a site of unsettling resemblance, a figure in whom imperial subjectivity and colonial subjectivity, and, by extension, imperial and colonial cultures, discover their contingent relation.

The final imaging of Stalky, in "Slaves of the Lamp, Part II," looks backward to Strickland of the Plain Tales From the Hills and forward to Kim.[17] For Stalky, the

---

[17]Strickland's "confederacy" with Kim is marked in Kim, which gives Strickland a place in the "Great Game." An earlier work, "Miss Youghal's Sais" (Plain Tales), reveals that Strickland is (as Kim will be) a member of the secret society of the Sat Bhai (the creation of which is ascribed, in Kim, to Hurree Chunder Mookerjee). A historical referent for figures like Strickland, Stalky, and Kim is to be found in Sir Richard Burton, explorer, ethnographer, prodigious polyglot, and cross-cultural shape-shifter, whose most noteworthy coup de théatre is probably his visit, incognito, to the sacred and forbidden city of Mecca.

passage across cultural barriers is more than simply strategic. It does not merely enact Strickland's orienting theory that the European master "should try to know as much about the natives as the natives themselves" (Plain Tales 24). Stalky in India discovers a place between cultures, a place of intercultural confluence, as is signalled by his final location "in the Jullunder doab"—a doab being "a tongue of land between two rivers" (Stalky 325n). However, Stalky's "becoming" a Sikh apparently provokes no "identity crisis"; whereas, the troubled interrogation of identity is, of course, a salient aspect of characterization of the more thoroughly hybridized Kim. Stalky, in this respect, is like Strickland, who represents "a successful acclimatization," a partial cross-cultural identification that enables British colonizer "to know and control the native Other" (Arata 23, 27). While he can "become" a Sikh, "Koran Sahib" nonetheless stops well short of Kim's seemingly unbridled access to Indian cultural identities. Stalky, however, significantly distinguishes himself from Strickland (and, in a sense, announces the advent of Kim) in that his capacity for cultural cross-dressing manifests an enduringly boyish liminality: Strickland's powers, acquired in his maturity, are the result of a disciplined (if at times outlandish) process of research; Stalky, like Kim, learns a new culture as a child does, by initiation. Kipling's creation of Stalky manifests more than simply "the observer's sharp eye," but does not yet give full expression to what Mark Kinkead-Weekes describes as "the dramatist's longing to get into the skin of many 'others'" (217). Only in Kim does Kipling envision, on the one hand, an imperial subject whose complex hybridity enables him to embody and represent the cultural variety and diversity of the Indian empire and, on the other hand, a highly sophisticated system of imperial domination (almost) capable of containing and controlling the disparate, yet potentially productive, energies of such a subject.

Kim: Disciplinarization, Hybridization, and the Liminal "Boy"

Lying as if in state at the centre of Michael Ondaatje's The English Patient is a man burned beyond recognition, beyond identity. "[R]eposed in his bed like a king" (14), grandiose in his imperturbable immobility, he reigns as the symbolic, sacrificial victim of a global conflagration, a war of European imperial powers turned "World War." He is a man without skin or face, with very little of what might be called a human body, a man reduced to the memory of himself, a dark "well of memory" (4). He remembers Africa. He was, one learns, a geographer of North African deserts, dedicated to discovering and mapping what little remained for modern Europe to discover and map. Speaking in an almost untenable present tense, he avers, "I am a man who can recognize an unnamed town by its skeletal shape on a map. I have always had information like a sea in me. I am a person who if left alone in someone's home walks to the bookcase, pulls down a volume and inhales it. So history enters us" (18). His history is thus, in large part, a matter of remembered maps and texts—maps that are texts, texts that are maps. The "truth" of his "false" identity, his self-ascribed "Englishness,"[1] resides in part, is confirmed in part, in the text-maps he remembers, the fragmented "classics"—the books in ruin, "the books for the Englishman" (7)—which his nurse-muse reads-recites to him. One such book, which seems to enjoy a special prestige, tells the tale "of the young boy in India who learned to memorize diverse jewels and objects on a tray, tossed from teacher to teacher—those who taught him dialect those who taught him memory those who taught him to escape the hypnotic" (7). The text, like a dreamwork, is fragmented, discontinuous, less than entire. Like a dreamwork, it constitutes itself as the listener drifts back and forth

---

[1]I stop short of saying that "the English patient" is really German. Given that Ondaatje's text interrogates the concept of personal identity unrelentingly, I think one can say, at most, that the "Englishman" was once—or better still—was also German.

between wakefulness and sleep. Yet the text is one the listener "kn[ows] already": "He was familiar with the map of the story. There was Benares in the east and Chilianwallah in the north of the Punjab" (94). The parts of the text-map invoke the whole and restore to the listener an "English" identity, or, perhaps more precisely, a dream of English imperial identity, Kipling's dream of Kim.

To reconstitute his lost identity the dying "English patient" is returned, not so surprisingly, to Kipling's tale of Kim. What more gratifying text of British imperial modernity might be chosen for him? Kim represents a key site of imperial desire, a promised place of fullness, of wholeness, where the pursuit of power coincides with the pursuit of pleasure, where the exercise of imperial power and its prerogatives does not entail isolation and alienation, where the imperial venture discovers its atonement, its "at-one-ment" with the spaces and cultures of the colonies. Embodied in the figure of Kim is a possible subjectivity, a possible identity, that must, one feels, have existed because one experiences it as lost and because one regrets the loss. (This logic of nostalgic, retrospective wish-fulfillment, for all that it is spurious, is nonetheless compellingly seductive.) The drive to return to Kim, to rediscover him, is in this sense like the burned man's erstwhile quest to rediscover the "Zurzura," the "lost oasis," which must exist because its presence has been spoken, has been promised, and because life in the desert (which is also life in the desert-wasteland of European modernity) is somehow unimaginable without it.

Despite the imperial nostalgia it registers, however, The English Patient presents at the same time a paradigm, a kind of fable, for the postcolonial reading of Kim. The Anglo-Canadian nurse offers an implicitly postcolonial reading of Kim, a colonial text. Her reading reconstitutes and transforms the text, resituates and recontextualizes it within a new and different historical moment. She recomposes it, seeking through its mediation to discover and define herself, her history, and, perhaps more pertinently, her relationship with an "absent presence"—an "English" identity and history, vestigial,

almost lost, almost unrecognizable, yet strangely, inexplicably enduring. Describing an essentially similar case in theoretical prose, Homi Bhabha writes,

> The [postcolonial] challenge to modernity comes in redefining the signifying relation to a disjunctive "present": staging the past as symbol, myth, memory, history, the ancestral—but a past whose iterative value as sign reinscribes the "lessons of the past" into the very textuality of the present that determines both the identification with, and the interrogation of, modernity. (Location 247)[2]

---

[2]I should perhaps acknowledge in more detail the complexity of Ondaatje's fable of postcolonial reading. The return to Kim (and to Kim) seems, in Ondaatje's imaginings, to be part of a process of spiritual, psychical healing, part of a cure: the charred "Englishman" is most typically characterized as an "English patient" who listens to a text read to him by his nurse. Questions must arise as to the nature of this "cure." Is the "patient" being cured by the text or cured of the text: is the process of (re)reading Kim restorative or purgative? For "the English patient," the reading process restores an identity (which is, in this case, very literally a fiction of self), but restores it only to release it to imminent, inevitable death; the process is, as the "Englishman" has written in another context, "a consuming of oneself and the past" (97). And yet, is there only one "patient"? The Anglo-Canadian nurse, as one learns, tends the "English" stranger in lieu of another burn victim of the war, her father whom she could not recover from the flames. The nurse has fallen "upon books as the only door out of her cell," and they have become "half her world" (7). She emerges from her reading sessions with "her body full of sentences and moments, as if awakening from sleep with a heaviness caused by unremembered dreams" (12). The reading ritual, moreover, has the form of the "talking cure," of the psychoanalytic encounter: the nurse, like the analysand, offers a fragmented, ellyptical discourse to a largely silent listener, a kind of father-figure, one who occupies the symbolic place of the father and proffers the occasional corrective intervention, the "lesson in reading"—"Read him slowly, dear girl, you must read Kipling slowly. Watch carefully where the commas fall so you can discover the natural pauses. . . . Your eye is too quick and North American" (94). The Anglo-Canadian nurse must learn how to read, how to reread, stories that are not her own, that are not for her (in so far as they are "for the Englishman"), stories that have come, nonetheless, to constitute her cultural patrimony and to inform her most intimate selfhood. Resolving, then, the perplexities of Ondaatje's "reading cure" evidently requires a "both/and" rather than an "either/or" orientation: both "the English patient" and the nurse are, in their different ways, to be cured by and cured of the texts with which they engage.

The return of The English Patient to the text of Kim, however, produces more than a fable of the practice and process of postcolonial reading. The young Sikh, Kip, whose name is almost "Kim" and almost "Kipling" (especially if one includes the surname—Kip Singh), enters Ondaatje's fictional world "as if out of this fiction [Kim]. As if the pages of Kipling had been rubbed in the night like a magic lamp. A drug of wonders" (94). Considering the figure of Kip can orient the reading of Kim by drawing attention to aspects of the text that may reward renewed critical reflection. Like Kim (and, for that matter, like Kipling) Kip is one of modern imperialism's "hybrid subjects," appearing upon the threshold joining yet dividing two cultures, British and Indian. As in the case of Kim, Kip's special placement is revealed to involve special aptitudes and talents, which, at least for a time, the young Sikh chooses to offer to the service of British interests. The nature of this service merits specific consideration in so far as Kip and Kim are both made to engage with the modern world in distinctly modern ways. The first allusion to Kim in Ondaatje's text returns to the boy who learns to memorize a diversity of objects presented upon a tray, the boy in the process of learning the techniques of observation and memory, surveillance and information-gathering, that are indispensable to the efficient practice of modern intelligence. Kip, for his part, acquires expertise in the area of modern weaponry, becoming a "sapper," a defuser of bombs. Ondaatje's Kip, situated in a time of global war and the breakdown of the modern empires, thus serves to pose the question of the relationship of postcoloniality and modernity even as Kim, in Kipling's earlier work, functions as the key figure in an examination of the relationship of imperialism and modernity.

Kip, however, unlike Kim, is explicitly engaged in the deconstruction of modern technologies of power and aggression: he studies the construction of bombs in order to take them apart, to defuse them. And, of course, Kip ultimately "deconstructs" his own role within European power-politics (the "Great Game" in which Kim never ceases to participate): hearing the news of the decimation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki,

Kip understands, with sudden and terrible clarity, that "They would never have dropped such a bomb on a white nation" (286); he realizes that the ultimate bomb, "the Bomb," is targeted upon him, upon the non-European. Kip, then, may be seen to complete the narrative trajectory of his predecessor, discovering and enacting (as Kim never does, as Kim is never allowed to do) a fully oppositional, anti-imperial agency. Kip, unlike Kim, finally rediscovers himself, repositions himself, as the insurgent colonial subject, as the Indian mutineer of 1857, who turns the significantly chosen Enfield rifle, the defiling weapon of European imperial aggression, upon the "Englishman" (Ondaatje 282-86). The question that must nonetheless remain for the contemporary postcolonial reader of Kipling is whether or not the possibility of Kip is already evident, already inscribed in the text of Kim. In other words, is not Kip's ultimately contestatory relationship with the modern imperial system (re)articulated upon, and thus in part sustained by, tensions and contradictions that are already present in Kipling's treatment of Kim? Does not Ondaatje's return to Kim serve to repose questions it had raised, to refocus, reconfigure and, at least to some degree, resolve certain inchoate ambivalencies and ambiguities informing that earlier text?

Wagering that these last questions can and should be answered in the affirmative, I intend in this chapter to reveal how the figure of Kim enables yet disrupts the Great Game of post-Mutiny British imperial management. Following Ondaatje's lead, my analysis will focus upon the placement and agency of the culturally hybrid subject within the modern world system. As my analysis will show, Kipling does not envision the modernization of India so much as the submission of a "timeless," archaic India to modern systems of British imperial domination and administration. The memory of the Mutiny, which, as I observed in my chapter on The Jungle Books, is inscribed in Kim by explicit reference and by allusive, allegorical restaging, orients and organizes Kipling's representation of modern imperial order in India. Questions of racial and cultural identity and difference are raised in the novel's opening passages, even as the

hybrid "boy" is proffered as a mediator, a "go-between," for British power. The hybrid adolescent lives and moves within Wurgaft's "gap"—the gap that, after the Mutiny, is presumed to divide and separate British and Indian cultures—functioning as the enabling, indeed indispensable, intermediary for the post-Mutiny project of detached domination. Kipling's imagining of power-knowledge applications in India entirely depends upon the hybrid Kim, who negotiates and sustains the relationship, at one remove, between imperial power—most notably embodied in the abstracted, Olympian Creighton (military officer, administrator, and ethnologist)—and the bustling multiplicity of Indian colonial subjects Kim encounters in the cities, in the countryside, on the trains, on the Grand Trunk Road. Although the imperial Great Game evidently exists before Kim's recruitment, Kipling's specific representation of its workings clearly requires the culturally liminal adolescent, whose ability to "blend in" signals his special capacity for the bearing of highly confidential, strategic information, for surreptitious surveillance, for cross-cultural information-gathering. As in the previous chapter, however, my analysis will consider the hybrid "boy" as both a productive and also a potentially disruptive figure within Kipling's representation of the British imperial project in India. The English Patient may be said to raise the question of the "historical agency" (Bhabha, Location, 199ff.) of Kipling's text, which is deployed by Ondaatje both as a seminal document of British imperial culture and as a potential source of decolonizing initiatives. My subsequent analysis will strive to show how and why Kipling's representation of Kim registers and, to a degree, reveals the potentially disruptive, problematizing effects that may be occasioned by the introduction of a hybridized subject to modern imperialism's culturally divided world.

The first part of the argument, which is oriented largely by the work of Michel Foucault, begins by considering Kim's unstable identity, his undecided and undecidable relation with paternity, and (therefore) the uncertainty of understanding and containing him under the law and within a dominant symbolic system of meanings and their

interpretation. Raising the question of the Foucauldian "disciplines," I will show how the attempt to subject the marvelous boy to the regime of imperial discipline works and also, at the same time, how it does not work. Having noted the perturbatory effects of multiple and hybrid ethnicities upon the disciplinary economy of Kipling's fictional, post-Mutiny Indian empire, I will proceed, in part two, to consider the ethnographic aspects of Kim, employing texts of contemporary postmodern anthropology and ethnography, most notably those of James Clifford. By examining Kim's complex, ultimately destabilizing role as ethnographic "field-worker" and as "native informant," and by demonstrating that Kipling's text manifests a failed attempt to produce a singular Western subject of knowledge, a transcendent Subject in whom various cultural identities, perspectives, and orientations cohere, I will show how Kim works and does not work as an ethnography of British India.

I

In "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Spivak argues that to accept "a self-contained version of the West is to ignore its production by the imperialist project" (291). The work of Michel Foucault, she finds, is curiously, yet tellingly symptomatic of the tendency to envision a self-contained "West," the ostensibly sovereign source of modern geo-political initiatives. As Spivak shrewdly observes, Foucault's multi-volume analysis of the history of Western modernity can be read as a peculiarly allegorical "miniature version" of the history of modern imperialist projects: Foucault focuses upon the "management of space—but by doctors"; upon the "development of administrations—but in asylums"; upon "considerations of the periphery—but in terms of the insane, prisoners, and children." Spivak concludes that the various topoi of Foucault's scholarship—"the clinic, the asylum, the prison, the university"—all seem to function as "screen-allegories that foreclose a reading of the broader narratives of imperialism" (291).

It is most specifically Foucault's investigation of the constitution and development of the disciplinary society that Spivak targets for critique. Disciplinary power, "the new mechanism of power [emerging] in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries . . . is secured," in Spivak's view, "by means of territorial imperialism . . . 'elsewhere'." Spivak, unfortunately, does not pause to detail and document the connection she notes here. Yet, given that the "new mechanism of power" (what Spivak aptly characterizes as "power-in-spacing") functions most characteristically by distributing and hierarchizing a multiplicity of subjects within mapped and managed space, it seems likely that the spaces of empire would provide key sites—perhaps, indeed, inaugural sites—for the experimentation and elaboration of disciplinary techniques. That is to say, it seems entirely probable that the acquisition of far-flung, culturally diverse colonies posed new problems of governance and social control—new problems that spurred the emergence and development of what Foucault has called "the disciplines."

Her critical caveats notwithstanding, Spivak concedes that Foucault's analysis of the mechanics of the disciplines can still provide a useful critical pathway for postcolonial scholarship, a pathway I intend to pursue, at some length, in this chapter. As Spivak's intervention clearly reveals, however, Foucauldian theory needs to be revaluated in the light of the modern European imperial project. To manifest its pertinence for the elaboration of a decolonizing cultural criticism, this theory needs to be used to critique articulations of power whose focal points are not the "metropolitan center" but rather the "colonial margins." Kipling's Kim provides an excellent opportunity for just such a critical maneuver, offering the postcolonial critic a literary work that uncannily foreshadows Foucault's socio-political analyses, a colonial text that registers the insinuation of the Foucauldian "disciplines" between the two terms of imperialism's much-invoked dyad, law and order. In Kipling's representation of British India, discipline, not law, is the predominant force that makes and maintains imperial order.

As Spivak duly notes, "the law" constitutes a key discursive system in and by which "the history of Europe as Subject is narrativized" (271). Crucial to the alibi of the "civilizing mission" is the notion of the rule of law, the notion that the colonizer initiates and sustains law and order in otherwise lawless lands. The colonizer's claim to moral authority is seated upon his paradoxical promise of "freedom under the law"; in the words of imperial poet Alfred Noyes, one must "Reign by that law which sets all nations free" (qtd. in Morris, Pax 176). As I will show, however, the text of Kim implicitly calls into question these fundamental legitimizing myths of the British imperialist project. This is not, of course, to suggest that Kim is an anti-imperialist text, but rather that it is pro-imperialist in curious and revealing ways.

As Eric Stokes makes clear in The English Utilitarians and India, to consider the question of the "rule of law" in British India is perforce to confront the decisive contribution of Jeremy Bentham and James Mill, and, in the later nineteenth century, James Fitzjames Stephen and John Strachey. The Utilitarian thinkers' powerful influence runs through the nineteenth century to the time of Curzon's vice-regency and Kipling's confirmation in the status of bard of the Indian empire (see Stokes 308-311). Bentham, representing an authoritarian and paternalistic political philosophy of "enlightened despotism," believed "Sovereignty was single and indivisible; its instrument was law speaking the language of command" (Stokes 72). He envisioned for India "a scientific body of law" (71), a rational political machine embodying the Enlightened virtues of "speed, efficiency, economy, regularity, and uniformity" (72). Closely aligned with that of Bentham, Mill's project for the reconstruction of British Indian government, as summarized by Stokes, consisted of "substituting the rule of law for that of personal discretion, reducing all law to a written statutory form and confiding its entire administration to a modern system of pure and efficient courts" (145); his resolution of the disorder he perceived in early nineteenth-century British colonial administration was, in his own words, "an accurate code, an adequate judicial

establishment, and a rational code of procedure" (qtd. in Stokes 146). Stephen, the "political philosopher" of the Indian Civil Service (Stokes 305) and the most prominent and influential inheritor of the Utilitarian legacy, advocated the rule of law "in the spirit of racial conquest that succeeded the Mutiny" (Stokes 269). Supported by his friend and ally, Strachey, "the tower of strength upon whom Mayo (1869-72) and Lytton (1876-80) leaned for support" (Stokes 282), Stephen rearticulated the Utilitarian tradition for the post-Mutiny Raj: for Stephen, as for Strachey, "The British government in India rested not on consent but force. Its aim and achievement could be summed up in two pregnant words—law and order. To this order and to this law India owed everything . . ." (283). As Stokes observes, both Stephen and Strachey represent "a view of British rule which stood for cold, aloof impartiality . . . and almost prided itself on its estrangement from its subjects" (285).

The influence of Utilitarian political thought upon Kipling's work is, I think, undeniable. In Kim, however, I would affirm that Kipling distances himself from the Utilitarian commitment to law, bringing to the forefront other less obvious aspects of the Utilitarian legacy. Kim certainly evidences the unswerving Utilitarian faith in dispassionate, rational, efficient administrative practice. Also inscribed here is the Benthamite notion of individual administrative actors carefully controlled by accountability and "inspectability" (Stokes 74). At the same time, Kipling manifests in Kim a Benthamite belief in "the need for the intervention of the protecting arm of the State in native society" (Stokes 157). The Kipling of Kim evidently shares with Bentham and Bentham's intellectual heir, John Austin, an attraction to "the efficiency of military methods," a dream of a colonial administration founded upon a military "analogy." As Stokes puts the case, "The cohesion, discipline, and perfect subordination of a military body, which worked almost in silence with the minimum of discussion and a few crisp commands, appeared to such minds a thing of intellectual beauty" (309). Kipling, moreover, as I will demonstrate in due time, applies to the

India of Kim a political machinery remarkably similar to that of the Panopticon—an application its inventor, Jeremy Bentham, never proposed.

I must certainly acknowledge, however, that a case can be made for Kipling as an advocate of the authoritative, yet ultimately beneficent force of law. Indeed, such a case has been made by Shamsul Islam. In Kipling's "Law", Islam finds in Law "the unitive principle around which the complex web of Kipling's thought is woven" (11). "The Law," Islam states in his conclusion, "can . . . be understood as a principle of order that is essential for the growth of both society and the individual," adding that "The nature and function of this master idea of Law is most fully expounded in the fables of The Jungle Books " (146).

It is understandable, given the substance of his argument, that Islam should emphasize The Jungle Books. Jungle Law does indeed provide the governing principle of jungle society: it is a world-making law, an empowered code that constitutes and informs its subjects, that acts upon subjects who, in response to its demands, enact it in turn. As Mowgli learns from Baloo, this Law, whose injunctions are "many and mighty," is "like the Giant Creeper, because it drop[s] across every one's back and no one [can] escape" (149). Yet this Law, as John Murray astutely remarks, has no ethical dimension. It is a pragmatic, expedient code of imperatives and constraints, propounded by sovereign authority and sustained by "threat of sanction" (Murray 5ff.), a law that clearly reveals its affiliation with the "analytical positivism" informing much English jurisprudence and, more particularly, the legal theory of the Indian Civil Service, during Kipling's time of writing (Murray 2-4). In Kipling's Jungle Law, as in positivist legal theory, the crucial opposition is not between "right" and "wrong," but rather, as Murray emphasizes, between "discipline" and "lawlessness" (7), and "the ultimate sanction," ensuring obedience and order, "is the deliberate, premeditated, disciplined use of force" (10).

Although in Murray's discussion "discipline" has no specialist, Foucauldian inflection, it is nonetheless likely that the Jungle Law Murray discovers—a pragmatic, non-ethical code aimed at assuring a given social order—would be susceptible to infiltration by the mechanisms and techniques of the Foucauldian "disciplines." And indeed, when the adolescent Mowgli ascends to the status of Master of the Jungle, it becomes clear that, in Bagheera's words, "There is more in the Jungle now than Jungle Law" (187). The black panther's somewhat cryptic comment is elicited, of course, by a renewed demonstration of Mowgli's capacity to "stare down" even the most powerful of his jungle companions. Mowgli's special power, the more than lawful power, takes shape as a gaze that commands the submission of those upon whom it falls. Mowgli, in childhood a subject under the law, manifests in youth a new kind of power, previously unknown in the Jungle and unmistakably disciplinary. Nor is Mowgli's "gaze of power" the only manifestation of the jungle's disciplinarization. As I observed in my earlier discussion of Kipling's jungle tales, Mowgli's triumph over Shere Khan and his destruction of the Indian village both involve disciplined practices—systematic surveillance, multiple-source information gathering, the carefully orchestrated management of space and spatial relations.

Already in The Jungle Books the "disciplines" are present as the unsettling supplements of lawful social order. As I noted in the preceding chapter, disciplined imperial practices inform the action of Stalky & Co., a text in which the place and purpose of the law is never clearly established. In Kim, too, the law is a decidedly discreet, oddly abstracted presence, a noteworthy element in the transcendental philosophy of the Tibetan lama, but one that does not assert itself in relation to the worldly practicalities of the novel's narrative developments. In this novel, which is among other things a spy novel, disciplinary techniques definitively take precedence over legal principles and practices as its adolescent hero becomes a secret agent, an initiate and practitioner of the Great Game of imperial espionage. Kipling represents a

British India administered by means of surreptitious surveillance, by the gathering and circulation of politically charged information. Social order under Kipling's fictive Raj is maintained not by the public and explicit operation of law but by the secret, "unofficial" workings of discipline.

Even a cursory examination of Kim reveals that the authority of law, so insistently (if at times somewhat equivocally) asserted in the earlier Jungle Books, is now very much open to question. The first of The Jungle Books opens with a poetic invocation, at once benediction and appeal, culminating with "Oh hear the call!—Good hunting all/ That keep the Jungle Law!". Kim, by contrast, addresses its verse opening, rather disparagingly, to "ye who tread the Narrow Way." And, as one quickly learns, the central character and eponymous hero of this novel is not to be numbered among these "treaders." This text's first prose sentence implicitly challenges the authority of law by situating Kim in delinquent relation to legal codes: "[Kim] sat, in defiance of municipal orders, astride the gun Zam-Zammah on her brick platform opposite . . . the Lahore Museum." Kim is introduced, very literally, en flagrant délit: he enjoys the forbidden pleasure of Zam-Zammah, not surreptitiously, but jubilantly, triumphantly, obstreperously. From the privileged heights of his illicit perch, he even goes so far as to address the occasional "rude remark" to a Punjabi policeman—who "grin[s] tolerantly" (3).

Evidently, Kim enjoys a special, decidedly indulgent dispensation in his relations with the law. The peculiar character of this relationship is most tellingly marked in terms of another relationship, Kim's relationship with paternity. In an amulet-case, the orphan Kim carries, along with his birth certificate, a Masonic document bearing his father's name and its underwritten imperative, "ne varietur." The amulet-case, fashioned by Kim's "half-caste" foster mother, serves to contain a mysterious and fearful magic power:

> If the woman had sent Kim up to the local Jadoo-Gher ["Magic House"/Masonic Temple] with those papers, he would, of course, have been taken over by the Provincial Lodge and sent to the Masonic Orphanage in the Hills; but what she had learned of magic she distrusted. Kim, too, held views of his own. As he reached the years of indiscretion, he learned to avoid missionaries and white men of serious aspect who asked who he was, and what he did. (2)

The continuance of Kim's free and easy way of life evidently depends not simply upon his being an orphan but, more crucially, upon the undisclosed nature of his familial legacy.

Placing his own work in relation with the findings of structuralist anthropology (most notably that of Lévi-Strauss), Jacques Lacan emphasizes the crucial symbolic importance of the marriage tie in social organizations, asserting that "The primordial Law is . . . that which in regulating marriage ties superimposes the kingdom of culture upon that of nature." This same primordial Law he posits as "identical with an order of language" (what Lacan will ultimately designate as "the Symbolic"). "For without kinship nominations," he reasons, "no power is capable of instituting the order of preferences and taboos which bind and weave the yarn of lineage down through succeeding generations" (66). Marriage ties and kinship structures thus situate themselves at the core of a socio-genetic lexicon, a social order at once lawful and verbal, which discovers its organizing, sustaining symbol in the name of the father: "It is in the name of the father that we must recognize the support of the Symbolic function which, from the dawn of history, has identified his person with the figure of the law" (67). The patronym is the key to symbolic identification with the father, which assures the father's child's claim to a legitimate place in social networks, but also marks that child as subject to the law of the father, to the socializing system of constraints and interdicts—all the various and peremptory Thou-shalt-nots—pronounced in the father's name. In Kim, however, the eponymous adolescent hero's

relationship with the patronym (whose austere power is suitably indicated by the "ne varietur"—"don't change it") is deferred, suspended—indeed, literally suspended in the amulet-case that hangs around Kim's neck. Kim is not yet marked by the name of the father nor subjected to paternal law.

Not surprisingly, therefore, Kim is a shape-shifter, a boy who has as yet no fixed, assigned place within the social order (as the child of the father whose name he bears), and who therefore enjoys an exceptional degree of freedom in the negotiation of his social status and identity. Kipling's evocation of the boy's life experience, moreover, does not evidence the regulated desire paternal law demands. On the contrary, Kim lives "a life wild as that of the Arabian Nights" (3), immersing himself in libidinal delights, giving himself to the unbridled and polymorphous pursuit of his pleasure. As Kipling reveals in a richly suggestive passage, Kim is a teaser of social boundaries, a tester of taboos, a fabulous interloper upon the margins of his social world, who enjoys "the stealthy prowl through the dark gullies and lanes, the crawl up a water-pipe, the sights and sounds of the women's world on the flat roofs, and the headlong flight from housetop to housetop under cover of the hot dark" (3).[3] Unlike Mowgli, whose place in the Seeonee wolf-pack is determined at the Council Rock by due process of Jungle Law, Kim cannot be adequately understood as a subject under the law. Freely and pleasurably transfiguring his person, identity, and social station from moment to moment, from situation to situation, Kipling's street-bred orphan, his "boy of the bazar," eludes legal definition: he has no fixed identity, no dependable place of residence, no established social position; he keeps questionable company and is no

---

[3]Kim's mobile, socially unbounded selfhood, his capacity to cross and recross cultural boundaries, receives extensive consideration in Judith Plotz's "The Empire of Youth: Crossing and Double-Crossing Cultural Barriers in Kipling's Kim." Aptly characterizing Kim as "an adolescent inhabitant of the border territory between childhood and manhood" (112), Plotz observes that "All India, especially that which is out of bounds, is Kim's province" (115).

stranger to shady deals, indeed "ha[s] known all evil since he could speak" (3). The boy, certainly, is not presented as an "evil" lad: opportunistic and déabusé, he nonetheless evidences a sense of "fair play," particularly in relation to the lama newcomer, to whose naivité he responds not exploitatively but indulgently and protectively, to whose "higher quest" he quite sincerely, if more than a little ironically pledges himself. Yet this penchant for fairness (which, as my subsequent analysis will occasionally reveal, is not uncompromised) does not change the fact that Kim, from an "objective" legal perspective, represents nothing more or less than an exotic (and unusually attractive) version of the juvenile delinquent. His lack of parental authority and guidance, his indeterminate social status, his vagrant "life-style," his preferred company and milieux—all these aspects of his characterization attest to such a designation.[4]

Now, as I mentioned earlier, Michel Foucault's scholarly project is, in large part, the study of "new methods of power," which he calls "the disciplines," and the consequent transition, in modern Western societies, from the lawful order of

---

[4]Foucault, in Discipline and Punish, documents a nineteenth-century French juvenile delinquent whose case provides a fairly precise analogue to that of Kim. Béasse is brought before the law in 1840. Foucault pieces the interrogation together from contemporary journalistic accounts: "'The Judge: one must sleep at home. - Béasse: Have I got a home? - . . . What is your station in life? - My station: to begin with, I'm thirty-six at least; I don't work for anybody. I've worked for myself for a long time now. . . . I turn cartwheels on the avenue de Neuilly; at night there are the shows; I open coach doors, I sell pass-out tickets; I've plenty to do. . . . - Does not your father wish to reclaim you? - Haven't got no father. . . . No mother neither . . . free and independant'" (290-91). Béasse is able to offer an ironic challenge to legal process because, jovial and sans regrets, he is unable to provide any of the "handles" (residence, occupation, familial affiliation) by which the law may apprehend and locate him as a legal subject. In the figure of Béasse, as the leftist press is prompt to affirm, "crime manifests 'a fortunate irrepressibility of human nature'" (289). Foucault observes, "All the illegalities that the court defined as offenses the accused reformulated as the affirmation of living force: the lack of a home as vagabondage, the lack of a master as independence, the lack of work as freedom, the lack of a time-table as a fullness of days and nights." (290).

sovereignty to the disciplinary order of administration and surveillance. In The History of Sexuality, Foucault concedes that "in Western societies since the Middle Ages, the exercise of power has always been formulated in terms of law" (87), but he posits a difference between the conventional representation of social power and the realities of its workings. He argues that "the juridical system," sustained by sovereign authority, "is utterly incongruous with new methods of power whose operation is not ensured by right but by technique, not by law but by normalization, not by punishment but by control, methods that are employed on all levels and in forms that go beyond the state and its apparatus" (89). The disciplines operate, as it were, on the underside of the law, infiltrating and transforming pre-existing social institutions. As Foucault emphasizes in Discipline and Punish, "[the disciplines] effect a suspension of the law . . . . Regular and institutional as it may be, the discipline, in its mechanism, is a 'counter-law'" (223). Discipline is concerned not with justice and the common weal but with the efficient practice of power; it addresses not the "what" and "why" but rather the "how" of social order.

As I noted a little earlier, Kim's delinquency is first indicated by his claiming of the Zam-Zammah perch in an illicit "king-of-the-castle game" he plays with two other boys (3), a game that establishes Kim in playful, insouciant relation with a massive phallic emblem of paternal law. (Indeed, employing imagery that combines alluring wish-fulfillment with the grotesque, the obscene, Kipling allows Kim to take possession of the forbidden phallus, to seat himself upon the great bronze gun, which protrudes, almost absurdly, from between his boyish thighs.) It would be worthwhile to consider the politics of this game, given that it constitutes the novel's first staging of social relations, given, moreover, that this "little game" orients the opening passages of a novel whose overall plot structure will be dominated by a "Great Game." Although its actions and its object are at odds with the law, the game is nonetheless explicitly concerned with power and social order, re-enacting, reproducing in little, a real socio-

political struggle. The Zam-Zammah cannon, as one learns, is popularly acknowledged as the symbol of social and political authority in the Punjab: "Who hold Zam-Zammah, that 'fire-breathing dragon,' hold the Punjab; for the great green-bronze piece is always the first of the conqueror's loot." Kim's success thus figures an English success, by which it is authorized:

> There was some justification for Kim,—he had kicked Lala Dinanath's boy off the trunnions—since the English held the Punjab and Kim was English. Though he was burned black as any native; though he spoke the vernacular by preference, and his mother-tongue in a clipped uncertain sing-song; though he consorted on terms of perfect equality with the small boys of the bazar; Kim was white—a poor white of the very poorest. (1)

Evidently, Kim need not display any of the usual markers of British colonial authority—white skin, English language, social standing, wealth. The issue of "race" is authoritatively, yet rather paradoxically, segregated from uncomfortable questions of ethnicity and acculturation: Kim <u>is</u> "white" (even though he is "burned black"), <u>is</u> "English" (even though he is not fluent in the English language). Kim's "racial identity" is guaranteed by the <u>name of the father</u>, the "trump card" secreted in the amulet-case, which Kim can play if and when he chooses. The importance of "racial identity" manifests itself in the way it affects the social situation: its invocation, by Kipling's narrator and subsequently by Kim, clearly upsets the supposed "terms of perfect equality," unbalancing power relations and enabling the hierarchical classification of individuals. "Abdullah the sweetmeat-seller's son" is Muslim and takes precedence over "little Chota Lal," who, although of extremely wealthy parentage, is Hindu. King-of-the-castle Kim places both, in relation to himself and to each other: "All Mussalmans fell off Zam-Zammah long ago! ...The Hindus fell off Zam-Zammah too. The Mussalmans pushed them off" (4). (Significantly, "white," "English" Kim unseats and replaces a "Mussalman," Lala Dinanath's boy, and thus

symbolically conquers the Muslims who had previously overcome Hindu peoples.) Tacitly acknowledging Kim as a representative of English authority, the Indian boys do not contest their own contingent designation as representatives of specific, subaltern groups. Both of them give over their bid for the possession of Zam-Zammah.[5]

In its development and still more clearly in its resolution the king-of-the-castle game enacts a social order that is sustained not by the authoritative force of law but by insidious workings of the disciplines. Defining the game in relation to a tacitly understood, tacitly accepted imperial proverb—"Who hold Zam-Zammah, . . . hold the Punjab"—Kim makes his own success a "rule" of the game. He recreates the "hierarchizing pyramid" of disciplined social structure. As Foucault points out, disciplinary power functions to assure "the ordering of human multiplicities" (Discipline 218): "the disciplines characterize, classify, specialize; they distribute along a scale, around a norm, hierarchize individuals in relation to one another and, if necessary, disqualify and invalidate" (223). Just so, Kim's disciplinary maneuver allows him to situate all players of the game in relation to an empowered "norm" ("whiteness" or "Englishness"), to actualize a "non-reversible subordination" of Indian by European and, simultaneously, to maintain a secondary hierarchy of Muslim former-conqueror and doubly vanquished Hindu.

Kipling's novel thus thematizes the disciplinarization of Indian society even before Kim is initiated to the practice of imperial espionage. Already evident, as well, is the

---

[5]The deployments of race and ethnicity I describe here clearly reflect what S. P. Mohanty characterizes as the post-Mutiny "racialization" of intercultural relations under the Raj, the production of an essentializing, hierarchizing discourse of race that "narrates conditions of political and ethical possibility, defining and reshaping ideas, ideologies, and interests" ("Drawing" 314). Clearly, it is only in the context of such racialization of the colonial Indian cultural scene that Kim's "Englishness" and "whiteness" can be asserted in the face of the concurrently acknowleged peculiarities of his acculturation. Racialization must therefore be understood as an important aspect of the disciplinarization of the Indian empire which I will shortly be delineating.

paralegal, if not downright illegal, dimension of this disciplinarization. One should not be surprised, therefore, to find that Kim takes to the disciplinary practices of the Great Game like a fish to water, nor that he takes in stride a fellow operative's later announcement: "We of the Game are beyond protection. If we die, we die. Our names are blotted from the book. That is all" (200). The Great Game has no official, legal status, nor do its agents. But then Kim is accustomed to living without the provisions and circumscriptions of the law.

Of course, the early movements of Kipling's plot are energized by a quest for the father, or rather, for the solution to the cryptic message contained in the name of the father, which is imaged in suitably awe-inspiring and heraldic terms: Kim's papers contain the promise of an "exalted" destiny to be discovered "between pillars—monstrous pillars—of beauty and strength" and in the company of "[n]ine hundred first-class devils, whose god [is] a Red bull on a green field" (2). Quite promptly, Kim fulfills his quest and discovers his relation with the father's name and law, returns to the father's regiment and, rather less fortunately, to the father's regimen. Indeed, the destiny proclaimed in the name of the father falls well short of its glorious promise. When Kim's paternity is revealed, his identity fixed, he briefly glimpses the decidedly less than exalted life of the "regimented" orphan: the deadening, Dickensian oppression of the Military Orphanage and its third-rate schooling, the "closely watched" days spent in the confinement of "trousers and jacket [that] crippled body and mind alike," the oppressive company of narrow-minded, bullying boys and unsympathetic masters (106)—the dreadful panoply of underprivileged life-under-the-law, the very life the earlier Kim had so scrupulously avoided.

Yet Kim's confinement under the law proves to be only a prelude to his release. His lawful destiny is ultimately nothing more than a harrowing sojourn: following "three days of torment" Kim is rescued, temporarily by the dashing heroics of Mahbub, and more permanently by the sager efforts of Creighton and the lama, who contrive

(with different ends in mind) to send the boy to St. Xavier's, the top-notch school for India's sons of empire. Here, Kim learns to be a "Sahib," receiving an empowering education in imperial disciplines, which prepares him (officially) for a career as a surveyor and (unofficially) for a career as an operative of the Great Game.

Certainly, one can assume that life at St. Xavier's is not carefree and free-wheeling. Kim, at his new school, nonetheless finds the means to pursue his pleasures, as the record of his indictments reveals: he is chastised "for breaking out of bounds . . . for smoking and for the use of abuse more full-flavoured than even St. Xavier's had ever heard" (123). Kipling, however, significantly chooses not to detail Kim's school life at Lucknow in any thorough-going way, twice affirming its lack of real interest and pertinence: "you would scarcely be interested in Kim's experiences as a St. Xavier's boy among two or three hundred precocious youths" (123); "The record of a boy's education interests few save his parents, and . . . Kim was an orphan" (164). Kipling does, on the other hand, offer an abundance of information about the process of Kim's exotic, alternative education under Lurgan Sahib. As one soon learns, St. Xavier's represents only one half, and not the better half, of the boy's educational prospects.

In Lurgan's house, which the proprietor characterizes as "a new madrissah" (a new school), Kim perfects disciplines of mind and body by applying himself once again, but more exactingly this time, to the games of his childhood at Lahore: the ever-watchful boy plays "the Play of the Jewels" (156), learning to see and remember more precisely; he rediscovers the pleasures of shape-shifting, reproducing a wide variety of cultural "identities" with ever greater exactitude. Lurgan's shop, with its extravagant array of exotic objects, reminds Kim of the Lahore Museum, one of the favorite haunts of his earlier boyhood—"This place . . . is like a Wonder House" (150). Lurgan himself calls to mind "a faquir by the Taksali Gate" (149) with whom the boy of Lahore had been familiar. Once again, as in childhood's lawless days, pleasure, power, and intrigue come together enticingly: Kim is initiated to the tantalizing secrets of the new

Wonder House and engages mind against mind with the wily and more than slightly sinister Lurgan (a Fagan-fakir in the service of the Empire). If, at St. Xavier's, the boy learns to apprehend himself in terms of the privileged yet constrained subject position of the "Sahib," under Lurgan's tutelage he is taught to make disciplined use of his libidinally charged liminality. Lurgan's intervention in Kim's education returns the boy to an earlier self, serving to revive, reshape, and redirect the subjectivity that existed before the advent of lawful constraints.

Lurgan's ultimate test, however, his ultimate lesson, concerns the establishment of a disciplined relationship between the two poles of Kim's subjectivity, his ultimately dominant "Englishness" and his ultimately subordinated "Indianness," a relation that is revealed in the famous ordeal of the broken jar. Focusing his pupil's attention upon a jar shattered a moment before, Lurgan attempts, by hypnotic suggestion, to make the boy see the jar whole again—"Look! It shall come to life again, piece by piece" (153). In the invitation to an envisioning of renewed coherence and wholeness, there is pleasure, even a subtle eroticism. Lurgan's hand settles "gently on the nape of [Kim's] neck, strok[ing] it twice or thrice." Feeling this touch, hearing the words whispered in familiar Hindi, Kim's "blood tingle[s] pleasantly through him" (153). Lurgan's mesmeric appeal clearly addresses itself to the "Indian" portion of Kim's personality. As the jar reassembles, Kim is "thinking in Hindi." Despite the pleasure he experiences, his mind—another portion of his mind—recoils from "a <u>darkness</u> that [is] swallowing it" (154, my emphasis).[6] Kim takes refuge in English language and, more particularly, in "the multiplication table in English": "The jar had been smashed—yess, smashed—not the native word, he would not think of that—but smashed—into fifty pieces, and twice three was six, and thrice three was nine . . . " (154). (The

---

[6]As Inden observes, the Indological imaging of Indian culture as a "sponge" is almost as commonplace as the "jungle" metaphor (85ff.). The "sponge" is clearly implicit in the evocation of a "darkness" that engulfs or "swallows."

second "s" of "yess" is not a misprint, but rather marks the accents of India-bred Kim's English.) Only after he has successfully dispelled the illusion does Kim allow himself to return to Indian words, even then announcing his triumph first in English, only subsequently in Hindi: "But it is smashed—smashed . . . . Look! Dekho!" (154). In the episode of the jar, Kim, to maintain his self-sovereignty, must choose "English" analytic thought and vision over an "Indian" synthesizing orientation, must choose "English" Symbolic logic over the "Indian" Imaginary disposition. In the fate of the jar is imaged the predicament of its perceiver's self and, at the same time, that self's relationship with its world: either one synthesizes or one analyzes; either one experiences oneself as whole and coherent, at one with a world reflecting back that coherence, or one acknowledges the fragmentation of self and world, the multifacetedness of both. Both orientations are available to Kim, but his usefulness as a player in the Great Game depends upon his retaining a capacity for analytic distance with respect to himself and his world. He must never be entirely enveloped or "swallowed" by any "otherness" in which he participates, by any subject position he assumes, or by any socio-cultural situation in which he involves himself. The Game requires one to see not the sublime and seamless whole (which is ultimately an illusion) but rather the discrete, differentiated parts; it requires one to see differences, to make distinctions, to order and distribute the piecemeal of the real. Kim's aptitude for secret service, most notably manifested in his marvelous talent for role-playing (which, like his success in the jar-trial, distinguishes him from his otherwise exceedingly gifted, Hindu fellow-pupil), is thus not so much a matter of Imaginary involvement and becoming as of Symbolic detachment and discernment, not a matter of being "Indian" but of reading and representing "Indian-ness," a disciplined decoding and recoding of a

variously acculturated selfhood in contingent relation with the often incommensurate demands of a multicultural world.[7]

Despite the self-disciplining rigors involved in his initiation to the intelligence Game, Kim is not required to forsake his pleasures. He is, of course, made to pursue them more self-consciously and more purposefully, to recognize and exploit their instrumentality. He is not called upon to choose power over pleasure, but rather to choose the pleasures of power (pleasures which, as my preceding analysis of the Zam-Zammah game reveals, have never been entirely unknown to him). As Kim promptly learns at Lucknow, "St. Xavier's looks down on boys who 'go native altogether.' One must never forget that one is a Sahib, and that some day . . . one will command natives" (125). After a year at the school (and following an adventurous time of "going native" in the service of Mahbub Ali) Kim goes to Lurgan at Simla with a clear awareness of the gratifications that "Sahib" status can procure: "Kim flung himself whole-heartedly upon the next turn of the wheel. He would be a Sahib again for a while. In that idea, so soon as he reached the broad road under Simla town-hall, he cast about for one to impress" (148). With Lurgan, Kim discovers the specific pleasures and powers of the India-bred "Sahib," the complex play of socio-cultural involvement and participation tempered by an ever-alert detachment. Kim's several years of schooling and training are punctuated by noteworthy episodes of zestful self-indulgence and adventure. Even as a graduate of St. Xavier's and a full-fledged player of the Great Game, Kim manifests unimpaired appetite and energy in his pursuit of

---

[7]Mohanty remarks that India unfolds under Kim's eye in ways that "mark potential distinctions and discriminations in ways of seeing and knowing" ("Drawing" 318)—hence the importance of seeing as reading. Kim is called upon to develop a "specific faculty of perceiving unities and differences as interpretable social facts," to become "a competent and reliable reader of texts, ultimately, in fact, of society as text" ("Drawing" 317-318). In the second part of this chapter, I discuss Kipling's remaking of Indian culture as text.

"the pleasures of imperialism" (Said, Culture 132ff.): the much-matured Kim who undertakes to disguise the fugitive E.23 is "thrilled with a boy's pure delight in the Game" (205)—the same delight that had characterized the child of the novel's earliest passages—and enjoys, upon the successful completion of the maneuver, a "thrice heaped contentment" (210); this same Kim is pictured, shortly after, with "begging-bowl held forth in silence, but eyes roving in defiance of the Law from sky's edge to sky's edge" (210), with mind "distracted" from sober meditation by "the very Wheel itself, eating, drinking, trading, marrying, and quarreling—all warmly alive" (211). Kim's hedonistic propensities, which have been cultivated rather than curbed, will forever save him, one feels certain, from the world-weary alienation so frequently represented by the imperial functionaries who people several of Kipling's earlier "Indian" tales.[8] For all that he will know hardship and perplexity, as signalled by the repeated question "Who is Kim?", this boy can always return, as he does in the novel's final passages, to the revitalizing embrace of Mother India.

By envisioning the imperial enterprise in disciplinary rather than lawful terms, Kipling is able to present a pleasure-productive imperialism, an Indian empire in which domination and administration take shape as a Great Game. The pleasures of Kim's career signal the primary and perhaps the most significant advantage recommending imperial disciplinarization over the rule of law: unlike the fundamentally repressive and prohibitive apparatus of law, disciplinary modes of power manifest, typically if not invariably, a productive relationship with pleasures, as Foucault first makes clear in the inaugural volume of his History of Sexuality. In the History, Foucault argues that disciplinary power accesses "the most tenuous and individual modes of behavior, . . . penetrates and controls everyday pleasure—all this entailing effects that may be those

---

[8]Particularly striking evocations of imperial alienation are to be found in "Thrown Away" (Plain Tales from the Hills), "At the End of the Passage" and "'The City of Dreadful Night'" (Life's Handicap).

of refusal, blockage, and invalidation, but also incitement and intensification" (11). He contrasts sovereign authority, encoded as law and sustained by "the right to take life or let live" (136)—which is, in the last instance, a "formidable power of death" (137)—with the more modern methods of power that undertake "the calculated management of life" (140). Elaborating upon this distinction, Foucault writes,

> Law cannot help but be armed, and its arm, par excellence, is death . . . . The law always refers to the sword. But a power whose task is to take charge of life needs continuous regulatory and corrective mechanisms. It is no longer a matter of bringing death into play in the field of sovereignty, but of distributing the living in the domain of value and utility. (144)

The life drives and the pleasures these entail are no longer submitted to the Procrustean schema of the licit and illicit so much as they are scrutinized, catalogued, administered, and productively deployed. Individual pleasures are not so much prohibited or restricted or "permissively" ignored, but rather are organized and put to use. Kim's pleasures, which are recruited to the service of empire, clearly provide a case in point. In the figure of Kim, Kipling embodies the possibility of an imperialism that knows power, order, and enjoyment, in more or less equal portions and at the same time. Kipling's narrative of the liminal boy at play in the Indian empire, having once discovered the potentialities of disciplinary regulation, can offer the imperial satisfactions of spectacle, adventure, and intrigue in full measure without ever turning its attention from the crucial concerns of imperial hegemony.

As Hurree Chunder Mookerjee appreciatively observes, Kim displays a capacity for "most extraordinary and effeecient performance" (159-60); the boy's imperial "performance" recommends itself not only in terms of its marvels and pleasures—its "extraordinariness"—but also in terms of its efficiency. By considering the question of imperial efficiency in historical terms, one comes to see that the choice of Kim as the focal subject in a disciplinary order of empire is indeed interestingly apt. As S. P.

Mohanty points out in "Kipling's children and the colour line," the Mutiny of 1857-58 "made the issue of Empire an urgent racial one" (27-8). During subsequent decades, therefore, "'poor whites' who lived close to the 'natives'" posed, more than ever, "a threat to the racial image that colonial whites wished to present to the India they ruled." Members of this "awkwardly intermediate class" were generally "confined to workhouses and made 'invisible' and 'useful' at the same time" (30). (Kim's early years, I should recall, are marked by the fear of being sent to an orphanage—a fate that very nearly overtakes the boy.) Kipling, however, offers a daring and ingenious alternative to the historical Raj's more or less arbitrary and inefficient exercise of legal prerogatives: Kim, an orphan, "a poor white of the very poorest," is initiated to the disciplines of imperial espionage. This street-urchin's intimate involvement in the Indian scene is re-envisioned as a source of potentially valuable "know-how." Equipped with his knowledge of Indian languages and customs, his seemingly innate instinct for observation and his talent for disguise, Kim can make British power effective in sites where domination by military force or by legal sanction is least practical—notably in the dispersed, multicultural spaces of rural India.

City-bred Kim, once in the service of the Raj, makes the best use of his talents in rural India. Upon being engaged in the Great Game by Mahbub Ali, a Pathan operative, Kim immediately sets off on a trek across the Indian countryside, which remains the preferred sphere of secret-agent activity throughout the novel. Kim, in his on-going initiation to the Great Game, repeatedly travels out and away from the novel's urban centers (most notably, Lahore and Lucknow). This foregrounding of rural settings is by no means incidental, but rather is informed by the real historical development of the Raj and directly related to Kipling's envisioning of effective imperial power-politics. As Mohanty points out in "Drawing the Color Line," the late nineteenth-century Raj is characterized by strategies of "invisibility and spectacularization," which are selectively deployed:

> Spectacles—exhibitions, durbars, the ritualization of the monarchy and its public activities—seem to be confined to the cities, both in England and in colonial India, while the concern with invisibility reveals itself in the contact with the colonial countryside, the world of the peasant and the sepoy (often the peasant sepoy) . . . . (340)

Kim may be a city boy, but his capacity to "blend in," socially and culturally, recommends him for service in the countryside, which poses a particularly nettled problem for the British hegemonic project. As Mohanty stresses, although the later nineteenth-century history of the Raj is largely one of successful consolidation, British authority met with "perennial resistance" in rural India:

> As the modern Indian peasantry took shape over the course of the century, particularly during the second half, the radical forms of political-economic change—forced patterns of migration and settlement, dispossession and relocation—led to both explicit and mediated kinds of anticolonial rebellion" (323).

The potential threat to British rule, here suggested, is enormous. Toward the end of the last century, the population of the subcontinent is already approaching three hundred million. The British presence in India, both military and civil, does not exceed one hundred fifty thousand. Moreover, only about one-tenth of the Indian population is urban, whereas British numbers are concentrated in the cities (Parry, Delusions 9-10). By mobilizing poor white Kim as an imperial agent, Kipling not only places a problematic subject within the containing grasp of Empire, but also enables British power to infiltrate, more thoroughly, more effectively, the relatively unknown and unpredictable spaces of rural India.

Kim's delinquency, a foregrounded aspect of his characterization which I noted earlier, is as useful to the empire as are his pleasures (which, of course, are frequently represented in relation to delinquency). And if one considers the other principal operatives of the Great Game, it becomes evident that Kim's delinquency does not

represent an isolated case. Kim's fellow agents are also questionable characters, are also members of refractory, or potentially refractory, social groups. E.23 is a Mahratha. (Lest one surmise that this status is merely a matter of disguise, Kipling emphasizes that the agent has the sensibilities of the "North-West man" [202].) As Percival Spear records, the Mahratha confederacy presented, from the time of Hastings and into the twentieth century, one of the most enduring and intransigent sites of resistance British power confronted: "Mahratha revivalism," spearheaded by the actions of Nana Sahib (a Mahratha chieftain), played a significant role in the Mutiny history (143); the Mahrathas' "regionalist" struggle for independence "set an example and was an important influence on . . . [India's] modern national movement" (159). Two key figures of the turn-of-the-century Congress, Gokhale and Tilak, "were both members of the same section of Chitpavan Brahmins in western India who had once provided the heart of the Mahratha resistance to the British." Tilak, most notably, aimed "to exploit . . . Mahratha patriotism in the service of the new nationalism" (Spear 171, 172). It is little wonder, then, that Kipling's Lurgan takes a particular pride in having transformed E.23 from "a bewildered, impertinent, lying, little North-West Province man" into an effective agent of the Raj (176). (Similarly noteworthy is Kim's decision to refigure—that is, disguise—a politically charged Mahratha as a politically disengaged Saddhu mystic.) Moving on to consider one of Kim's more significant cohorts, I note that Mahbub Ali is a Pathan, an Afghan. In the imperialist discourse of the later nineteenth century, the Afghan is typically envisioned as a dangerous enemy of the Empire. But such is not the case in Kim. As Said remarks, "Mahbub Ali, Creighton's faithful adjutant, belongs to the Pathan people, historically in a state of unpacified insurrection against the British throughout the nineteenth century, yet here [in Kim] represented as happy with British rule, even a collaborator with it" (148). As for Hurree Chunder Mookerjee, another imperial agent, he is a Babu, a Western-educated Bengali. The very type of the much-despised "mimic-man,"

the embodiment of "sly civility" (Bhabha, "Mimicry"; "Sly"), Hurree is the most inscrutable of the "inscrutable Orientals"—cowardly yet wily, a matchless dissembler, and, as the colonized subject most able to turn the weapons of the master against the master, always potentially subversive. As Gauri Viswanathan points out in her Masks of Conquest, the Babu represents the failed promise of the British attempt, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, to create a Western-educated class of colonial mediators. The Babus were never admitted to the higher positions within the British imperial administration, the very positions for which their education seemed to prepare them. By the late nineteenth century, Western-educated Bengalis were voicing their discontent, emerging as a significant subversive force in the Indian press.[9] Kipling's Babu, neither administrator nor journalist, finds his niche as a gifted spy. As he proves, when confronted with non-British Europeans (the French and Russian enemy-agents), Hurree can play the discontented Babu, can stage in person what the Russian describes as "the monstrous hybridism of East and West" (239): tactically feigning drunkenness in the company of the enemies, Hurree Babu

> became thickly treasonous, and spoke in terms of sweeping indecency of a Government which had forced upon him a white man's education and neglected to supply him with a white man's salary. He babbled tales of oppression and wrong till the tears rolled down his cheeks for the miseries of his land. Then he staggered off, singing love-songs of Lower Bengal, and collapsed upon a wet tree trunk. Never was so unfortunate a product of English rule in India more unhappily thrust upon aliens. (237)

---

[9]For a fuller account of the problems besetting the Anglicizing initiative of the Raj, see Viswanathan's chapter six, "The Failure of English." Concluding this chapter, Viswanathan focuses upon "the tension between the upward mobility promised by modern studies and the limited opportunities open to the colonized for advancement . . . . At one level, education as part of the state is complicit with the reproduction of an economic and social order. But because education is also expected to provide opportunities for advancement, it becomes an arena of social conflict" (164). Moreover, "The colonial subject's resistance to British rule occurs in the ideological space created by this contradiction, transforming education in its dual aspects of social control and social advancement into the supreme paradox of British power" (165).

A disciplined collaborator, however, Hurree never turns his shifty talents squarely against the Raj. His representation of the Babu malcontent reproduces historical actualities, but from the British imperial perspective (as the parodic aspects of the above scene reveal) and in the service of British interests.

The mobilization in imperialism's Great Game of such potentially refractory elements as Kim, E.23, Mahbub, and Hurree manifests a signal characteristic of disciplinary society, what Foucault calls "the differential supervision of illegalities." As Foucault points out, "although the juridical opposition is between legality and illegal practice, the strategic opposition is between illegalities and delinquency" (Discipline 277). In a disciplinary society, the force of law does not exert itself most vigorously to eliminate delinquency but rather to administer it. What occurs is the emergence of "enclosed illegality," a dispersed, heterogeneous class of known delinquents, a class which, once isolated and infiltrated, can be used to detect and circumvent the more dangerous illegalities--those that present a real threat to the established social order. Even as the "ex-con," the prostitute, the pimp, the vagrant are employed, in modern Western societies, as informants, as agents that extend the scope of generalized social surveillance, so the poor white boy, the Mahratha, the Pathan, the Babu come to serve, in Kipling's fictive India, as instruments of imperial domination. And it is precisely their location upon the potentially disruptive margins of the imperial social order that constitutes their utility. As Foucault states the case,

> Delinquency, with the secret agents that it procures, . . . constitutes a means of perpetual surveillance of the population: an apparatus that makes it possible to supervise, through the delinquents themselves, the whole social field. Delinquency functions as a political observatory (Discipline 281).

To speak of "a political observatory" is, of course, to evoke the idea of the Panopticon, Jeremy Bentham's intricately designed supervisory apparatus, in which

Foucault finds "the architectural figure" of social control in disciplinary societies (Discipline 200-209). And, indeed, once Kim and his fellow agents are disseminated throughout the Subcontinent, in the cities, in the countryside, on the roads and in the trains, they articulate what is effectively an Indian Panopticon. Kipling thus offers, in the virtual absence of legal apparatus, a post-Mutiny fictional actualization of the orienting ideals of the Utilitarian project in India, staging the efficient, rational, impersonal production and administrative application of governmental power. In keeping with the post-Mutiny mentality, he imagines a disciplinary apparatus that produces and functions upon a detailed abundance of demographic and ethnological knowledge, but, at the same time, minimizes direct, confrontational contact between the Raj's empowered officials and its subject peoples. In Kipling's India, imperial power is not simply represented but also enacted by intermediaries. British power-knowledge is gathered and applied not by cross-cultural encounter and exchange but by mediated observation.

As Foucault stresses, disciplinary power's most notable, most efficient instrument is "the instrument of permanent, exhaustive, omnipresent surveillance, capable of making all visible." Collectively, Kim and his cohorts, the surreptitious "overseers" of imperial order, exercise the power of "a faceless gaze that transform[s] the whole social body into a field of perception: . . . eyes posted everywhere, mobile attentions ever on the alert, a long, hierarchized network . . ." (Discipline 214). Not surprisingly therefore, Kim most typically witnesses a bustling, mobile India, whose movements are manifestations of nothing more than "happy Asiatic disorder" (64). Not surprisingly, India under Kim's eyes is "happy" under the Raj. Offering a more disturbingly suggestive statement of the case, Kinkead-Weekes writes, "the world is strangely disinfected as it passes through Kim's eyes" (217). Speaking in Foucauldian terms, the "gaze of power" is a pacifying gaze: it produces the docility of the dominated, the docility of all those who know their actions may be observed, their words overheard,

by some unseen representative of power. One cannot adequately account for Kim's India, as Edward Said wishes to do, by suggesting that Kipling did not, indeed could not, imagine an India "unhappily subservient to imperialism" (Culture 145). In Kim, Kipling does not wishfully or wistfully imagine an India "at peace" with the Raj, but stages, rather, a sophisticated system of socio-political domination capable of producing and maintaining the desired "peace." In Kipling's fictive India, precise, detailed information gathered from dispersed sources moves rapidly from the peripheries to the centers of power. The Raj sees and knows immediately, thoroughly, concentrating and applying the required force without delay. Understandably rare as these may be, insurgent initiatives (such as the hostile "princely alliance" of the novel's early chapters) are nipped in the bud, put down by means of a pre-emptive military maneuver.

The India of Kim has, of course, no actual historical referent. The Raj was never so efficient, the peoples of India never so docile. However, as Wegner puts the case, "while Kim represents neither India nor empire in its 'real truth', the narrative does illuminate important aspects of the specific historical terrain on which it unfolds" (132). Its imperialist utopianism notwithstanding, Kipling's text represents the real, if less colorful attempt to discipline an India which, during the Mutiny, notably, and in subsequent decades, demonstrated its intractability to British rule. The novel envisions a post-Mutiny Raj disengaged from its own power-practice, a strangely abstracted Raj exercising power at a distance, elaborating a structural, administrative system of domination that locates in the subject peoples (beginning, of course, with the intermediaries themselves) "the principle of [their] own subjection" (Foucault, Discipline 202-03). Kipling recognizes that modern imperialist expansion and consolidation raise issues of social control with new and unprecedented intensity, that, at least in the area of governmental administration, the possibility of any stubbornly enduring "colonial belatedness" must be ruled out. For Kipling, the most modern,

most sophisticated administrative techniques are required "out there" in the colonies—and most particularly in India, that extremely populous and culturally diverse colony where a colonizing few are called upon to supervise and control a multicultural many.

In Kipling's Kim, imperial power functions and is maintained not in relation to authoritative codes of law, but rather in relation to disciplinary practices of administrative surveillance. Power discovers itself in practical, situational, opportunistic ways. Kipling's novel, when examined in the light of Foucauldian theory, offers a staging of systems of social control produced by and within a process of colonial domination. It does not enact a law brought from afar so much as it elaborates itself "on site" in response to the specific demands of the post-Mutiny imperial project in India. Kipling's stages of an efficient political machinery for British India. Therefore, this novel does not, in the last instance, sustain an envisioning of a sovereign, self-contained "West" exerting itself, unaffected, upon its colonies. Notwithstanding its representation of a disengaged Raj whose practice of power is thoroughly mediated, Kim presents a vision of a "West" that shapes itself in its effort to reshape and dominate other cultures, other worlds. Moreover, the imperial culture's involvement with the colonized culture is marked by the same elements that enable its putative detachment, that is, by the mediating subjects produced by effects of cultural hybridization—the indigenized white boy, the co-opted Pathan, the Western-educated Bengali.

My argument thus returns to questions I touched on earlier, questions concerning the colonizing subject's involvement with the societies and cultures of the colonized, concerning also the pertinence of that involvement to imperial authority and agency. Citing John McClure, Wegner asserts that, "despite his expressed desire to reform the practice of imperial rule, Kipling in no way questions the deeper ontology of empire—an 'authoritarian view of the world as a place structured in dyads of dominance and submission, obedience and isolation, power and pain'" (132). While this world-view is

largely confirmed in Stalky & Co., the case of Kim (the text to which Wegner refers) is perhaps not so clear-cut. Kim does stage multicultural India in relation to a more than tacit power divide, which is promptly drawn by the "racialized" assertion of Kim's "white," "English" identity and by the power-play of that identity in the Zam-Zammah game. Yet as the narrative progresses it becomes increasingly clear that cultural and ethnic identities are not always susceptible to such sharp delineation, such unimpeachable hierarchization. Kim, although he provides the most spectacular instance, is not the only example of a character who straddles, crosses and recrosses imperialism's power divide. Mahbub aligns himself unfalteringly with British power, yet is unapologetically a Pathan and, despite moments of jovial self-ironizing, outspokenly adheres to the religion and culture of his people. One may also speak of Hurree Chunder, the Western-educated Bengali who combines Royal Society ambitions with atavistic superstitions, or of Lurgan, whose ethnicity remains as mysterious as his status in the hierarchy of the Great Game.[10] Whereas Colonel Creighton's socio-cultural (and political) location is represented unambiguously—Hurree's peremptory affirmation that Creighton is European requires no qualification—other prominent, more active if less powerful Great Gamesters are difficult to specify and classify, difficult to situate within the normalizing, hierarchizing systems of disciplinary order.

As my preceding discussion has made clear, disciplinary power functions by situating subjects within a social field, by classifying, distributing, hierarchizing. The mechanism of the Panopticon, as Foucault stresses, aims to maximize the efficiency of any project of subject formation and social control, to facilitate supervision in the prison or the asylum, education in the school, productivity in the factory (Discipline

---

[10]The black-bearded, fakir-aspected Lurgan is perhaps to be understood as Eurasian, a possibility suggested in Kim's ambivalent appraisal of him: "He was a Sahib in that he wore a Sahib's clothes; the accent of his Urdu, the intonation of his English, showed that he was anything but a Sahib" (151).

200-201, 203-204): "The Panopticon is a marvelous machine which, whatever use one may wish to put it to, produces homogeneous effects of power" (202). The enabling key, however, is sure knowledge of the subject's assigned position within the supervisory architecture, a position that need not be continuously verified if it is at all times verifiable. A multicultural, ethnically diverse and increasingly hybridized social context might therefore pose problems with respect to the political and hegemonic application of disciplinary systems. The emplacement of the disciplines may not be impeded, but the end they serve may become, at least to some degree, multiple and divided. Disciplinary power does not flow vectorally from the upper to the lower echelons of the social body. It is relayed through a multiplicity of subjects; it circulates through all social levels. In the social context I invoke, which is the context of Kim, the disciplines may serve, therefore, to enable transgressions of the power divide inscribed by imperialist intervention, may serve to unbalance the dyad of dominance and submission.

A close consideration of the following scene from Kim should serve to clarify these last points and render my suggestions more concrete. Kim professes news of war to a group of Indian listeners and, to prove his story, performs a description of his source, the Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Armed Forces—a performance whose truth is to be verified or denied by a retired Sepoy who has seen the "great man":

> ". . . Look now. First the great man walks thus. Then He thinks thus. (Kim drew a forefinger over his forehead and downwards till it came to rest by the angle of the jaw). Anon He twitches his fingers thus. Anon He thrusts his hat under his left armpit." Kim illustrated the motion and stood like a stork.
>
> The old man groaned, inarticulate with amazement; and the crowd shivered.
>
> "So—so—so. But what does He when He is about to give an order?"
>
> "He rubs the skin at the back of his neck—thus. Then falls one finger on the table and he makes a small sniffing noise through his nose.

> Then He speaks saying: 'Loose such and such a regiment. Call out such guns.'"
>
> The old man rose stiffly and saluted.
>
> "'For'"—Kim translated into the vernacular the clinching sentences he had heard in the dressing-room at Umballa—"'For'" says He, 'we should have done this long ago. It is not war—it is a chastisement. Snff!'"
>
> "Enough. I believe. I have seen him thus in the smoke of battles. Seen and heard. It is He!" (48)

On first examination, this little scene seems clearly to confirm, in an unproblematic way, the disciplinary force of imperial power. Functioning as a proxy, Kim makes the Commander-in-Chief and the authority he embodies present and effective even in absence: the crowd of Indian listeners remains "breathless-still" throughout Kim's performance, and draws one "long, quavering breath" at its conclusion (47, 48); the retired Sepoy (the "old man") goes so far as to salute, then stands for some time "at attention" (48). Closer and more extensive consideration reveals, however, that the scene cannot be read so simply and unequivocally. To begin with, Kim's performance is duplicitous, literally doubled: Kim represents a low-caste Hindu boy representing the British Commander-in-Chief. In so doing he undertakes what is, in the context of the novel as a whole, a singular, implicitly forbidden action—the representation of a white man (and a highly placed, powerful white man at that) by an Indian. The representation, moreover, is enabled by a preceding act of surreptitious, exacting surveillance, detailed right down to the idiosyncratic and tell-tale "Snff!". The "great man" is thus captured within the narrative's generalized disciplinary schema, seen rather than seeing, represented rather than self-representing. His person, his decisions and actions, and his secret information (the receipt and distribution of which is his more or less exclusive prerogative) are offered to an Indian collectivity for discussion and evaluation, are submitted to the economy of rumor, whose unpredictable, potentially subversive effects I have had occasion to discuss previously. The scene of Kim's performance, despite its optimistic affirmation of just and uncontested British

authority, is haunted by the specter of the Mutiny. Kim, one may now recall, brings news of anti-colonial initiatives of sufficient moment to necessitate a fairly massive military response ("eight thousand redcoats" with artillery support [47]). As Kim begins his performance, the Mutiny is mentioned for the first time, when the narrator briefly recalls "the days of the Mutiny" (46); shortly after the performance, the old soldier "[tells] tales of the Mutiny" (50), preparing for the extensive discussion of the Mutiny story that soon follows (52-53). No anti-imperial sentiments or enunciations find their way into the immediate dramatic situation, but insurrection is in the wings and, at centre-stage, Indians are offered politically charged information that should not be theirs and thus enabled to evaluate and judge the workings of the governing power accordingly. One can see, moreover, that Kim's multiple, undecided ethnicity is the key factor in the creation of this situation. Kim's European heritage, together with the supplement of Indian acculturation, recommends him for secret service, but also allows him to surreptitiously acquire privileged information. His easy familiarity with the codes and customs of Indian sociability and his tacit validation of Indian society (as evidenced by his drive to be a success, to distinguish himself within that social context) motivate and facilitate his disclosure and also augment the social effects of his performance.

Multivalent, hybrid ethnicity thus associates itself with a disorderly proliferation of disciplinary power. Kipling's text registers, mutedly yet revealingly, the possibilities, the destabilizing potentialities, of such proliferation, yet affords it a place in the cultural framework of the Raj. Ethnicity such as Kim's, although undecidable and at times unpredictable in its expression, is not unknown and unknowable; it is, like other aspects of the Indian cultural scene, susceptible to documentation. "In Kipling's novel," writes Deirdre David, "imperialism is a notably efficient operation, appropriating, for instance, the newly established scientific discipline of ethnography" (134). To supplement and, as it were, guarantee the imperial effectiveness of the

political practice of "the disciplines" his novel stages, Kipling employs a modern scholarly "discipline." The ethnographic rendering of colonial India works to produce a controlled distribution of multiple, shifting ethnicities, to contain the potentially disruptive energies of hybridization and unbridled intersubjective, cross-cultural exchange—what Pratt calls "transculturation" in the "contact zone" (6),[11] what Kipling, slipping significantly if only momentarily into the register of colonial terror, names as "the monstrous hybridism of East and West" (my emphasis). (This last phrase, of course, voices the Russian agent's evaluation of the character of Hurree Chunder, who, as my later discussion will demonstrate, embodies colonial terror—and not only for relatively uninitiated Russian interlopers.) Ethnography, in my view, represents the crucial and decisive gambit in Kipling's "Great Game" of imperial domination. In the second part of this chapter, I will examine the ethnographic aspects of Kim, seeking to document, describe, and evaluate the overall ethnographic project of the text, focusing my attention upon the figure of the liminal boy, whose centrality within the textual economy will be once again and still more clearly confirmed.

II

To suggest that Kim can be approached as an ethnography is immediately to raise questions about Kipling's status as an ethnographer. As James Clifford observes in his "Introduction" to Writing Culture, ethnographic writing is normally governed by generic determinations and "is usually distinguishable from a novel or a travel account" (6). Clifford nonetheless acknowledges that "Ethnography is an emergent interdisciplinary phenomenon," which "blur[s] the boundary separating art from science" (3). The ethnographer, for Clifford, is a text-maker whose work ineluctably

---

[11]Pratt's "contact zone" is "the space of colonial encounters, the space in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing realtions." "Transculturation" names the intense, typically agonistic process by which interacting cultures (and the interacting subjects of these cultures) influence and transform each other (6).

requires "expressive tropes, figures, and allegories that select and impose meaning as they translate it" (7). The textual practices of ethnography and literary art are thus potentially compatible. And indeed, in Clifford's view the ethnographer is a writer concerned with "the inscription of coherent ethnographic fictions" (6). If Kim is not an ethnography in the purest sense, yet it includes ethnography; it evidences an ethnographic project. The India of Kim is clearly not exotic backdrop or trompe l'oeil conforming more to the urges of imagination than to the exigencies of cultural documentation and representation. This text provides ample evidence of what one might call the ethnographic impulse, the writerly drive to grasp and document cultural realities. If, as Arnold Krupat suggests, ethnographers are most fundamentally, most crucially, the "providers of data for the understanding of other worlds" (80), then Kipling must be granted a certain status as an ethnographer.

More specifically, one can consider Kipling as an imperial ethnographer. Invariably, as George Marcus avers, "closely observed cultural worlds are imbedded in larger, more impersonal systems" (166), are written and must be read in integral relation to a determining "context of historical political economy" (167). Ethnographies, writes Clifford, "are systems, or economies, of truth. Power and history work through them, in ways their authors cannot fully control" ("Introduction" 7). Kipling's representation of India must therefore be read in terms of the implicit and explicit relations it establishes with British imperialism in India.

The ethnographic impulse manifests itself in Kim a variety of ways. The novel's opening scenes, which serve admirably to orient the action and to introduce the principal themes, occur in and around "the Wonder House," that is, the famous museum of ethnology in Lahore. Kim's subsequent relationship with a Tibetan lama has significant ethnological implications, as do his relationships with Mahbub Ali and Hurree Chunder Mookerjee. Both Hurree Babu and Colonel Creighton, the "unofficial" head of the novel's imperial spy network, are ambitious ethnographers.

Moreover, this linkage between spying and scholarship is neither arbitrary nor coincidental. Ethnology and ethnography are crucial elements within the British intelligence project. As Kim learns from Lurgan (a lesson the Babu confirms), careful attention to ethnological data—right down to its most minute details—is the key to success as an imperial agent: it enables Kim to become a master of disguise—enables him, that is, to stage an ethnology "in person," to embody and enact an ethnography.

Implicit and explicit linkages of knowledge and power, of ethnology and imperial practice, are to be found throughout Kipling's novel. Such linkages manifest themselves at the very outset, in the encounter between the Red Lama and the curator of the Lahore Museum. Indian culture is presented as a British possession. Although Kipling pictures eager peasants "hurrying up to the Wonder House to view the things that men made in their own province and elsewhere" (4), the Lahore Museum, as Kim duly informs the inquisitive lama, is "the Government's house" (6). All those seeking knowledge of India—including, of course, those who are natives of India and, as such, producers of its culture—must consult British holdings and solicit the explanations of a "white-bearded Englishman" (7), the curator-Sahib. Encouraged by Kim, the lama enters the Museum and immediately confronts imagery attesting to the precedence and the enduring pre-eminence of Western cultural achievements in relation to those of the East; in conformity with the principles enunciated by Said in his Orientalism, the British ethnological museum at Lahore presents the newcomer with "derivative" Oriental masterpieces, which strive to recapture an earlier, more masterful, Western artistry: "In the entrance-hall stood the larger figures of the Greco-Buddhist sculptures done, savants know how long since, by forgotten workmen whose hands were feeling , and not unskillfully, for the mysteriously transmitted Grecian touch" (6). The superiority of the European, however, is most tellingly a matter of knowledge. "Savants know," Kipling's text assures us, virtually everything there is to know of the so-called "mysterious" East. The curator (clearly to be numbered amongst these

"savants") produces a "huge book of photos" containing images of the lama's own lamassery. He knows the details of the life of "the Excellent One," which is represented by the Museum's carvings and also in abundant books—learned works in "French and German, with photographs and reproductions" (8). To questions concerning "Oriental" cultures, the curator can answer with authoritative simplicity, "It is written. I have read" (9). If his knowledge finds its limit with respect to "the River of the Arrow," whose waters promise "freedom from the Wheel of Things" (10), yet his knowledge of the Wheel itself, that is, of the socio-cultural life of the subcontinental world, seems to comprehend both the general and the minute—an implication that is confirmed by his parting gift to the lama, the spectacles of European manufacture that bear the promise of a clearly detailed, far-reaching "envisioning" of the material, phenomenal world. Thus, in his novel's opening movements, Kipling represents an amply documented "Orient" whose socio-cultural realities are securely encompassed by a European knowledge imperium. The Museum passages posit an "Orient" that is not "mysterious" but objectively known, an accountable "Orient" whose concrete elements can be located and delineated, authoritatively organized and represented.[12]

The Orientalist and "orientalizing" propensity, which situates "the East" in meaningfully subordinate relation to "the West" (see Said, Orientalism 49-73), is already apparent in Kipling's treatment of the Greco-Buddhist sculptures and persists throughout his text. Kipling's narrator repeatedly makes generalizing and authoritative statements upon Oriental character and custom. Orientals, for example, possess a penchant and a talent for fabrication and duplicity: Kim can "lie like an Oriental"

---

[12]The quotation marks enclosing "Orient" are intended, in accordance with Saidian scholarship, to mark it as a concept and to question it as a designation of a cultural actuality or locale. Having thus noted the dubiousness of "Orient" and "oriental" as terms of cultural description, I will henceforth omit the quotation marks as much as possible.

(23)—that is, spontaneously, unscrupulously, elaborately, and well; "Asiatics," one is told, "do not wink when they have out-maneuvered an enemy" (24). Most typically and most significantly, however, such Orientalist statements address issues of temporality: as Mahbub Ali comes to clear awareness of the pressing nature of an intelligence mission, one is instructed that "even an Oriental, with an Oriental's views of the value of time, could see that the sooner [the information] was in the proper hands the better" (22); as Kim and lama enter a benighted yet crowded train station, the narrator affirms that "All hours of the twenty-four are alike to Orientals" (26). A particular, Oriental relationship with time is also made evident when the narrator observes that "one anna in each rupee" is "the immemorial commission of Asia" (27); when he describes a dispirited, frustrated Kim, who abandons plans for concerted action and "[falls] back, Oriental-fashion, upon time and chance" (106); when he details the movements of Mahbub's caravan, which breaks camp "swiftly—as Orientals understand speed—with long explanations, with abuse and windy talk, carelessly, amid a hundred checks for little things forgot" (142).

This last account of an Oriental-style breaking of camp deserves special attention in so far as it contrasts sharply with an earlier description that calls attention to the wondrous speed and efficiency with which the Maverick regiment sets up camp:

> The plain dotted itself with tents that seemed to rise, all spread, from the carts. Another rush of men invaded the grove, pitched a huge tent in silence, ran up eight or nine more by the side of it, unearthed cooking-pots, pans, and bundles, which were taken possession of by a crowd of native servants; and behold the mango-tope turned into an orderly town as [Kim and the lama] watched. (81)

"Sorcery!" exclaims the Oriental lama to an equally bedazzled Kim. But what the two have witnessed is, more exactly, the staging of the efficient use of time, the everyday practice of the time-mastering European, "the routine of a seasoned regiment pitching

camp in thirty minutes" (82). Oriental time, "the easy, uncounted Eastern minutes" (188), is thus to be understood in relation to an alternative model, always implicit; ambling, undifferentiated Oriental time contrasts with European time, which is apportioned, regimented—quite literally, pressed into service. Just as clearly, European time is the time of imperial enterprise, the time that enables the Mavericks, together with their duly marshalled "native servants," to "invade" the virgin mango grove, and to make of it, in thirty precisely measured minutes, "an orderly town." Considered in relation with the narrator's statements upon Eastern temporality, the Mavericks' pitching of camp offers itself as a representative staging of a grander spectacle, the productive mastering of a timeless "East" by a time-binding "West."

To specify and characterize Oriental temporality from a Western perspective is, of course, to make an ethnographic distinction, one that is clearly not lacking in significant socio-political implications. In Kipling's text, the "allochronism" of ethnographic discourse (Fabian), which constitutes a strategic difference between the time of the observed, cultural other and that of the Western observer, does not serve merely to affirm, once again, the superiority of European cultural paradigms. It also reveals something of the method and the means by which that illusion of superiority is secured and maintained. As Clifford notes, the power to represent cultural realities has often been posited upon the Western writer-observer's special capacity to apprehend time "objectively." The traditional discourse of anthropology "speaks with automatic authority for others defined as unable to speak for themselves ('primitive,' 'pre-literate,' 'without history')" ("Introduction" 10). Kipling's India is represented as being "without history" in the sense that it is submitted to what Clifford calls "synchronic suspension" ("Ethnographic" 111). As Inden observes in his Imagining India, the "India" represented by Western Indologists is a place of long-standing cultural stasis—a stasis Kipling renders in predominantly temporal terms. In Kipling's Wonder House, India's different "times" are presented in spatial contiguity,

compartmentalized in such a way that a "time" or "period" represents not a distant and distinct past, but rather another (supplementary, adjacent, equally "present") manifestation of an eternal, essentially unchanging "India." Precise historical information exists, but is apparently of little importance: "Savants know how long since" the Greco-Buddhist sculptures were fashioned by "forgotten workmen." What is important is that the sculptures present another aspect of "India"—as do the contemporary regional handicrafts of an adjacent hall—that they contribute to a broadly inclusive, largely transhistorical reading of "India."

As Talal Asad ascertains, deeply embedded in the traditions of Western anthropology is the tendency to transform the "notion of culture . . . into the notion of a text—that is, into something resembling an inscribed discourse" (141). Kim, in this respect, presents an interesting case in point. The ethnologically, historically informed gaze, which is exercised most saliently by the narrator, does not restore history to the Indian scene, but rather employs the "historical sense" to perceive and confirm the effective absence of a dynamic history. The timelessness of Kipling's "India" allows for its treatment as a text, as an assembly of signifying elements whose order is necessary, invariable—fixed, as it were, for all time. To deprive India of a dynamic historical temporality is to exclude the very possibility of innovation and change. It is to create an India whose cultural manifestations are pre-scribed, written in advance, an India that ceaselessly recites itself: "All India," Kipling assures his readers, "is full of holy men stammering gospels in strange tongues; ... dreamers, babblers, and visionaries: as it has been from the beginning and will continue to the end" (32, my emphasis). Ostensibly, Kipling does not remake India as a text—something one would expect an ethnographer or, for that matter, a novelist to do—so much as he writes out a reading of the text India always-already is. For all that it is multifaceted, the cultural object of study is perceived as something stable, as a kind of museum-text to which one can return, again and again. As it was, so it shall be. The elements of the cultural text

can be located, specified, classified, with the assurance that locations, specifications, and classifications are not susceptible to historical contingencies. As Clifford observes in "On Ethnographic Allegory," ethnographies "that have not historicized their objects" tend to

> [portray] exotic societies in an "ethnographic present" (which is always, in fact, a past). This synchronic suspension effectively textualizes the other, and gives the sense of a reality not in temporal flux, not in the same ambiguous, moving historical present that includes and situates the other, the ethnographer, and the reader. (111)

Under the eye of the skillful and informed reader-observer, the bustle and flux of India—its "happy Asiatic disorder"—becomes its pageantry, its spectacular, strangely ceremonious re-presentation of itself: "This," the narrator avers, "[is] seeing the world in real truth . . . —bustling and shouting, the buckling of belts, and beating of bullocks and creaking of wheels, lighting of fires and cooking of food . . ." (73). The narrative process of Kim reinscribes in its own way the kinds of methods and procedures that characterize the Great Game and affirms, as does the Great Game, that India, in all its diversity, can be known and controlled. Like the Great Game, Kipling's ethnologically informed narrative serves to organize and reproduce a "vast mass of 'information received'" (21). In Kipling's India, as is confirmed in Kim's final return to life, the ordering consciousness of the trained observer can always "lock up anew on the world without." Everything will "[slide] into proper proportion." Meanings and purposes will be revealed: "Roads [are] meant to be walked on, houses to be lived in, fields to be tilled, and men and women to be talked to." Everything will be shown to be "real and true" and "perfectly comprehensible" (282).

Although Kim's consciousness is ultimately presented as a site of perfect knowledge, one must nonetheless recognize that the boy most typically functions as something of a rogue element within the controlled and controlling knowledges

Kipling's novel deploys. Within the timeless, changeless pageantry of India, Kim consistently discovers and enacts the new and the unprecedented. (Indeed, as a black white boy, as an English—and/or Irish—Indian, he may be said to embody the new and unprecedented.) Kim drums his heels upon the austerely symbolic Zam-Zammah, keeps company with fakirs, catches forbidden glimpses of "the women's world" behind the purdah, roams the bazaar and kicks a holy cow in the nose (while dressed as a low-caste Hindu boy!). As the little "Friend of all the World," Kim freely traverses discrete social spaces, exchanges castes and creeds, scrambles categories, obscures distinctions. His antic life seems, on first consideration, to challenge the adequacy of the ethnological science which the Lahore Museum displays and the Great Game puts into practice.

One should not conclude, however, that the boy has no productive role within Kipling's imperial ethnographic project. As Inden argues, the image of India as meticulously distributed cultural stasis does not reflect inherent social forms and structures, but is rather a sense-making imposition of the categories and concepts of Western Indology, which produce a deeply determined, essentialized India informed by "the mind of Hinduism" (85 ff.) and ordered upon archaic, supposedly fixed and unchanging stratifications of "caste society" (49 ff.). Kim's gay liberty is constituted as exceptional and thus contrasts with and sets in relief an Indological "India" of self-imposed social stricture and constraint. India is imaged in Kim as doubly controlled—by imperial authority and its sustaining power-knowledge, certainly, but also by structures, codes, and taboos of "Indian culture." In the figure of Kim, Kipling discovers the means of representing a free-wheeling "experience" of Indian culture, one that is characterized by unrestricted access and mobility, yet one that does not significantly unsettle the image of India as a static society of fixed (and therefore fully knowable) social forms, as a discretely ordered multiplicity. The boy's irreverent transgressions remind us of the boundaries that inscribe Indological India. Kim

provides, moreover, a subjective and fully participatory perspective that does not perturb and contradict so much as it supplements and completes the objective knowledge contained in archives, artifacts, documents, and maps. He creates the possibility of maintaining the "delicate balance of subjectivity and objectivity" (Clifford, "Introduction" 13) that a thorough-going ethnography is expected to produce.

Evidently, then, the election of Kim as the central, organizing character of an ethnographic fiction is by no means arbitrary. Indeed, the marvelous boy recommends himself in a variety of ways as an enabling figure for an imperial ethnography of British India. As I have shown, Kipling's narrative discourse rearticulates and reinforces an Orientalist representation of India as part of a timeless, eternal East, as a place that is somehow outside history. It is the business of the Great Game, moreover, to secure India from the perturbations of history: illegitimate princely alliances must be nipped in the bud; Russian incursions must be stopped at the frontier. It is not so surprising, then, that a boy should play an important role in this Great Game: spaces like the India of Kim, spaces outside history, seem to solicit the figure of the boy, even as this figure solicits such spaces. One may recall, in this regard, the "Neverland" of J. M. Barrie's Peter Pan or the island of the Crusoe myth, which is appropriated for boys in R. M. Ballantyne's The Coral Island. In the popular imagination of Victorian Britain, it would seem that the "boy" is situated outside history, at least in the sense that he is not in it yet. As Jacqueline Rose observes in The Case of Peter Pan, the child is insistently envisioned as "a pure point of origin" in relation to language and the social (8). The child—or, as in the present case, the boy of imperial fictions—is therefore presumed to have an intuitive, unmediated, "natural" relation with his world. The boyish presence thus de-historicizes, de-politicizes. Seen through Kim's "approving eye" (73), India under the Raj is happy and unself-conscious. Everything is as it should be, as it has always been, as it will remain. The boy provides an alibi of disinterestedness, operating as an embodiment of what Krupat calls "the putatively

innocent eye of the observer," an eye that early ethnographers such as the highly influential Franz Boas (a contemporary of Kipling) did not doubt or question, an eye that could (and should) function without the aid of "aprioristic theory" (Krupat 89-90).

The value of the boy, as an instrument for imperial ethnography, is also evident in the intersubjective realm, where he serves to mediate cross-cultural colonial relations. Occupying a middle ground between the (adult, male, European) colonizer and the (adult, male, non-European) colonized, a boy like Kim has no stable identity; his subject position—always in flux—can never be reliably assigned. Alternatively, Kim is identified both with the colonizer and the colonized. European by birth,[13] he represents imperial authority. Yet he is very much subject to that authority—as is his counterpart, the "colonial native," whom the discourse of colonialism insistently represents as a "child."[14] The figure of the boy has a function akin to that of the "median category" described by Said in his groundbreaking Orientalism. The "median category," Said suggests, "allows one to see new things . . . as versions of a previously known thing." And yet, "such a category is not so much a way of receiving new information as it is a method of controlling what seems to be a threat to some

---

[13]Of course, Kim's "Europeanness" is open to debate at every level. In saying that Kim is European by birth, I am conforming, temporarily, to Kipling's envisioning of Kim's "true nature" as "English" and "white." I do, however, isolate the sustaining myth of Kim's European cultural identity in my subsequent discussion of "the intangibility of the innate" (229).

[14]In Kipling's text, the treatment of Teshoo-lama provides an instructive case in point. From his first appearance a thematics of childhood attaches to the character. He is pictured as "helpless"(5), unable to make his own way in the world—in need of direction, incapable of effectively providing for his fundamental need for food. He promptly manifests guilelessness (a childish trait with which the precocious Kim is not burdened) and a capacity for wonderment. Explicit inscriptions of the child-figure soon follow: the lama presents the curator with a note of introduction bearing "clumsy, childish print" (7); touring the museum, the holy man is "delighted as a child at each new trove" (8); "Simply as a child" (13), the old man delivers his begging-bowl to Kim; he discusses future projects with his new-found disciple, speaking as "hopefully as a child" (34).

established view of things" (58-9). As a site of knowledge that is somewhat charted and familiar, the "median category" allows the Orientalist or the anthropologist or the ethnographer to apprehend and to negotiate radical difference. It constitutes a familiarizing displacement: the relatively familiar "Near East" mediates the confrontation with the "Far East"; similarly, the familiar figure of the boy mediates the confrontation of the imperial subject with the potentially uncanny colonial other. One establishes a putative control over this other by envisioning him as a kind of child. This supposed affinity, between the child and the colonial subject, begins to account for the atmosphere of mutually acknowledged peerage characterizing Kim's relations with subcontinental adults—with fellow Great Gamesters, Mahbub and Hurree, and with the lama, who is, paradoxically, Kim's master and his dependent.

Of relatively unfixed, indeterminate identity, the "boy" is highly susceptible to "indigenization." Mowgli with his wolves and Tarzan with his apes represent variations upon this theme. The "boy," however, suffers little from the stigma generally associated with "going native." The adult colonizer who "goes native" is beyond recuperation—ruined, lost. One may consider Conrad's Kurtz or, for that matter, Kim's father—renegade soldier, bazaar loafer, opium addict. The indigenized boy, on the other hand, is simply taken in hand, recruited, disciplined, and schooled. Unlike the man, the boy does not betray and abandon a European selfhood, he has yet to acquire one. Just as the wolfish Mowgli is not yet human, so Kim, the "boy of the bazar," is not yet European. In both cases the boy's true nature and identity are secured by the invocation of an essentially racialist notion of the relationship of nature to nurture, a notion Jean-François Gournay names as "l'intangibilité de l'inné"—the intangibility of the innate. Though Mowgli is raised by the denizens of the jungle, he is necessarily, inevitably human: "Man goes to Man at the last" (321). Even so, as the narrator assures his readers on page one of Kim, Kim is "English" and "white." The "boy" of imperial myth lives and moves within a circular teleology: he progresses

toward a true character already inscribed in his origin. More importantly, however, once he has been reclaimed, once he has been adequately, if not entirely, disciplined and subjected, the indigenized boy is an invaluable tool: Mowgli's uncanny woodcraft leads to a promising career with the Department of Woods and Forests; Kim's continuing access to subcontinental culture and society enables him to provide imperial power with a view from the inside. Access to the insider perspective, observes Clifford, can provide an ethnographic project with "new angles of vision and depths of understanding" ("Introduction" 9).

Kipling's articulation of his ethnographic project in close relation to the hybrid "boy" seems, upon cursory consideration, to resolve the kinds of questions raised in James Clifford's The Predicament of Culture, a deconstructive analysis of the history of Western ethnographic practices. How can the supposedly objective outsider effectively and accurately observe a culture? On the other hand, if ethnographic practice is oriented in terms of involvement or even immersion, how then can the ethnographer reliably represent an "otherness" in which he or she is deeply implicated? Is one then a participant or an observer? Does not involvement seriously compromise ethnographic authority? Kipling's answer to all these troubling queries is Kim, the "indigenized" white boy who is able to mediate the ethnographer's relationship with the "otherness" of India.

In relation to India, the cultural object of study, Kim is offered as an insider/outsider, as the principal agent but also as the spectacular, highly engaging, preferred object of the cross-cultural gaze. Speaking in specifically ethnographic terms, Kim has a function akin to that of the "participant observer" and also to that of "native informant." By recognizing the dualities that inform his role, one can begin to appreciate how the hybrid boy may complicate as well as enable an imperialist ethnographic project. Given its inscription within an imperial context, the articulation of Kipling's ethnography must negotiate a core issue, the power to represent. Who

disposes of this power? Who represents whom? How? To what end? As the field-worker who participates and observes, Kim is clearly aligned with British imperial authority, that is, with the power that represents. As the native informant, however, Kim is tacitly or implicitly aligned with the objects of power, with those who are represented. Situated on both sides of imperialism's power divide, Kim is an ambivalent figure, a site where imperial power is deployed, but also, at least potentially, a site of resistance.[15]

Certainly, the process of Kim's initiation to imperialism's Great Game reveals the boy's capacity to resist, at least partially, the power that plays upon him. During his inaugural mission, Kim dutifully delivers Mahbub Ali's message to Colonel Creighton, then proceeds to spy upon the Colonel and to eavesdrop upon his conversation with the Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Armed Forces. And, of course, in a scene I have taken up already, the impetuous, rather indiscriminate boy relates what he has seen and heard to a crowd of eager-eared Indian listeners—just to enjoy the prestige that accrues to the teller of such a tale. Later, the schoolboy Kim periodically slips out of the confines of St. Xavier's, to visit his lama or simply to indulge in the pleasures of the town. Disregarding the plans Creighton has made for him, the fledgling agent

---

[15] I should note that, quite apart from the highly fraught issue of imperial ethnography, the conventional ethnographic roles of participant observer and native informant present, in and of themsleves, some rather knotted complexities for the cultural critic. "Participant observation," writes Clifford, "obliges its practitioners to experience, at a bodily as well as an intellectual level, the vicissitudes of [cultural] translation. It requires . . . language learning, some degree of direct involvement and conversation, and often a derangement of personal and cultural expectations" (Predicament 24). As for the native informants, Clifford affirms that "their intentions are overdetermined, their words politically and metaphorically complex. If accorded an autonomous textual space, transcribed at sufficient length, indigenous statements make sense in terms different from those of the arranging ethnographer. Ethnography is invaded by heteroglossia" (Predicament 51). For further discusssion of the problems and questions that inhere in these two ethnographic subject positions, see Rosaldo and also Clifford's "Introduction."

disappears without a trace during his first three-month school holiday. Kim's accession to the status of full-fledged agent is marked by an esoteric and unauthorized Indian rite of passage: the boy becomes a "Son of the Charm," a member of a secret organization within the secret organization of the Great Game. This exclusively Indian clan, invented by Hurree Babu, is "strictly unoffeecial" and, if one can trust Hurree's word, entirely unknown to Creighton. ("Colonel Creighton," Hurree explains, "he does not know. He is European" [182].) Kim's insider status, his intimate knowledge of the Indian scene, makes him both a valuable and an uncertain imperial agent. His insider knowledge provides him, moreover, with the means to ensure that his terms are respected: as he warns Mahbub Ali, "a most beautiful land is this of Hind.... Into it I will go again if Mahbub Ali or the Colonel lift hand or foot against me. Once gone, who shall find me?"(146).

One must acknowledge nonetheless that neither Mahbub nor the Colonel are greatly worried by Kim's errant escapades (in so far as they are aware of them). The Pathan horse-dealer concludes that the colt has spirit, the colonial administrator, that the insolent boy has "some resource and nerve"(142). In the end, as both these senior players correctly surmise, Kim will play the Great Imperial Game and play it well—even if it means endangering Teshoo-lama and compromising the holy man's quest for salvation and enlightenment. Similarly, Kim proves to be, as I have suggested already, a very serviceable ethnographic agent, processing ethnological data ever more thoroughly and efficiently, staging "in person" various Indian cultural "identities," generally enabling imperial power to maneuver within and manipulate the cultural contingencies of the contact zone. By referring exclusively to the énoncé of Kipling's narrative one cannot come to a full appreciation of Kim as an ambivalent figure, nor recognize the ambivalencies he inscribes upon Kipling's ethnographic project. One must also be attentive to the énonciation—that is, one must pose the question "Who is speaking?" in its full complexity and examine the discourse in relation to a speaking

subject. Or, to put it another way, one must consider Kim and Kim in relation to another ambivalent figure, the narrator who enacts the role of the ethnographer.

The ethnographic apparatus of Kim is clearly not constituted by the hybrid boy alone, but by the relationship between the boy and the narrator. It is the narrator's indispensable function to document the boy's thoughts, feelings, and actions, to gaze upon the boy in the imperial contact zone and orient the reading both of the boy and of the India he experiences. The narrator of Kim is not disengaged from the actions he records; he is not, in the high Modernist manner, off in a corner dispassionately paring his fingernails. Although something less than an obstreperous presence, this narrator nonetheless manifests himself as a personality, as one who guides affective and imaginative responses and actively assists the sense-making process of his reader.

The narrative enunciation of Kim evidences both authoritative detachment and sympathetic engagement. In the novel's first sentence, the narrator refers to "the old Ajaib-Gher—the Wonder House, as the natives call the Lahore Museum." Here, the narrator speaks knowingly, yet maintains his authoritative distance, offering first the vernacular name, then immediately translating it and marking it as "native." What "the natives" call the "Ajaib-Gher," the narrator calls the Lahore Museum. He, quite clearly, knows more and better than they do. Yet one has only to turn the page to see how quickly attitude and perspective can change. On page two, the narrator introduces "the big blue and white Jadoo-Gher—the Magic House, as we name the Masonic Lodge." As before, the vernacular name, then the translation—but to whom does this "we" refer? Certainly, "we" know the Masonic Lodge is the Masonic Lodge, so one can assume that "we" are not "natives." The group with which the narrator identifies would seem to be the acclimatized "Anglo-Indian" community. What is noteworthy, however, is the suggestion that this ostensibly European group prefers to use the vernacular names for things, even for such "un-Indian" things as the Masonic temple. The narrator who represents the hybrid boy, identifies himself not with the home-bred

English—who, as the Sahiba will later announce, are "worse than the pestilence" (76)—but with a partially hybridized group whose characteristic habits and attitudes have been inflected by experience of India.

The opening passages of Kim raise the question of cultural difference or, more precisely, of cultural differentiation, not only in relation to Kim (a case I have considered already) but also in relation to a "we" proposed as the site of narrative enunciation. Although different from "the natives"—the "they" of the opening passages—this "we" shares a language with them. Yet, as one soon learns, the accessing and ordering of cultural difference in the world of Kim cannot be achieved by means of a singular idiom shared by "natives" and partially assimilated colonizers. The opening proposition—that "the natives" call the Museum the "Ajaib-Gher"—is a misleadingly simple statement, which presents an ultimately untenable envisioning of "native" homogeneity: the Indian populous may concur in naming the Museum as a "Wonder House," but would use a plurality of terms to designate it as such. Kipling's text, as it develops, registers a multiplicity of competing codes—English, Urdu, Hindi, Punjabi, Pushtu—none of which is clearly constituted as definitive and authoritative. English, of course, predominates, but it is not so much a language of preference as one of necessary, if often partial and imperfect, translation. Kipling's narrator not only acknowledges but employs a multiplicity of linguistic codes. His narration stages in a variety of ways the heteroglossia of British India, a heteroglossia that must undermine the early, too easy rendering of the readily negotiable binary of "we" and "they," of Anglo-Indians and colonized, subordinate natives.

The language of Kim is necessarily hybrid, yet—this must be stressed—more hybrid than it need be. The narrator chooses to use a variety of "alien" terms, not all of which are marked as such by italics, many of which are not provided with accompanying English translation. (Most typically, the narrator introduces vernacular vocabulary by presenting the duly italicized foreign term followed by a parenthetical or

appositive translation.) Certainly, the narrator's easy familiarity with subcontinental languages may be seen to augment his claim to ethnographic authority. Authority, however, is not the only issue. As I suggested a little earlier, the narrator betrays a taste for subcontinental vocabulary and inflection. He uses many foreign terms not once (to show he knows them) but repeatedly. He retains untranslatable puns: "Thy man is rather yagi (bad-tempered) than yogi (a holy man)" (13). He retains curious instances of hybridized English such as "tikkut" and "te-rain." The dialogue the narrator-ethnographer records is generally rendered in a formal, highly figurative, archaic English, a stylistic decision that tends to situate speech and action in the timeless realm of fable, certainly, but also one that foregrounds the act of translation. By mimicking the forms and figures of subcontinental languages, the dialogue recalls that English is very rarely the spoken language of Kim.

The narrator does not, moreover, sharply and consistently distinguish his own voice from that of his characters. Upon the lama's first appearance, for example, one reads,

> [Kim] stopped; for there shuffled round the corner, from the roaring Motee Bazar, such a man as Kim, who thought he knew all castes, had never seen. He was nearly six feet high, dressed in fold upon fold of dingy stuff like horse-blanketing, and not one fold of it could Kim refer to any known trade or profession. (4).

The following brief passage ushers in the novel's final movement: "Towards evening, when the dust of returning kine made all the horizons smoke, came the lama and Mahbub Ali, both afoot, walking cautiously, for the house had told them where [Kim] had gone" (283). The narrator's discourse, as evidenced in these passages, is like the

dialogue he records: it is richly (at times extravagantly) figured, faintly archaic, syntactically idiosyncratic.[16]

The language of Kim fails to create for the narrator a singular and separate position of synoptic transcendence. Unquestionably, the totalizing voice of ethnographic (and imperial) authority asserts itself when the narrator offers peremptory statements upon the Orient. And yet, this same narrator occasionally records outlandish manifestations of the Indian folkloric imagination with dispassionate equanimity, as if rendering yet another cultural fact: "A churel is the peculiarly malignant ghost of a woman who has died in child-bed. She haunts lonely roads, her feet are turned backwards on the ankles, and she leads men to torment" (138); "Witches—when their time is on them—can lay hold of the heels of a man's soul" if he steps upon their shadow (182). Similarly, when Kim and the lama take to the Grand Trunk Road, the narrator notes an encounter with "a troop of long-haired, strong-scented Sansis with baskets of lizards and other unclean food on their backs" (71). One might assume, according to colonialist stereotype, that all "natives" are "strong-scented." And in terms of British food standards, lizard would be distasteful and disgusting rather than "unclean"—a term that would sound quite Pentateuchal and archaic to the modern, metropolitan, English ear. A change of identification, positionality, and perspective is evident here, a change that takes a more extreme form when the narrator speaks of "the English"—"the careless, open-spoken English folk" (148)—as if referring to an alien group, or when he alludes, with bland disparagement, to "the dull fat eyes of . . . Sahibs" (118).

---

[16]Plotz notes the foregrounding of "linguistic 'code switching'" in Kim, affirming that "The India of Kim is not a babel but a harmony of many voices" (115) and that "Kipling's single Kim idiom contains all the differing codes" (116). While I would not contradict either statement, I would observe that neither acknowledges the narrator as a character who speaks various voices and participates in various codes. To consider the narrator as a character-speaker, as my argument tries to do, complicates considerably the issue of "code switching."

Evidently, "the English," as much if not more than "the natives," find their position in the "they" of narrative enunciation.

The narrator, as one would expect, keeps very close to the eponymous hero of Kipling's text. The alluring presence of Kim provokes and, in a sense, justifies the shifting of the narrator's position, away from authoritative, informed detachment and toward sympathetic involvement. The narrator is quick to suggest that he, like Kim, is one of those who prefer to speak in the vernacular. Like Kim, he confronts subcontinental folklore with the casual imperturbability of an insider. For the narrator, as for Kim, the Sansis are specifically and notably "strong-scented." For both of them, a cultural hygiene that pronounces lizards "unclean" is familiar, commonplace. For both, "the English" constitute a more or less antipathetic, alien group. Clearly, the narrator identifies with Kim and strives to demonstrate that he has access to Kim's experience, that he can see the world through the boy's eyes.

Ethnographically speaking, once again, the narrator and Kim seem, at least upon cursory examination, to enjoy a fairly workable, complementary relationship. The two together reproduce the two faces of the ethnographer as participant observer. The first face, as outlined by Clifford, is that of the child in the process of discovering and learning; the second is that of the knowing adult-initiate who later writes the experience (Predicament 40). Clifford, however, characterizes this dyadic paradigm as a "fable of rapport," observing that the crucial transition, the progress from the "child"'s often intense experience to the "adult"'s "confident, disabused knowledge," is generally an achievement of style, a ruse of the finished text (40-41). The question to be asked of Kipling's narrator, then, is the same as that which Clifford asks of the ethnographer who involves himself in the culture he studies: "If ethnography produces cultural experiences through intense research experiences, how is unruly experience transformed into an authoritative written account?" (25). Clifford finds that intensive involvement with the culture of study invariably undermines the ethnographer's

capacity to maintain stable, coherent positionality as a subject of discourse: the ethnography of involvement tends to be composed, as Kim is, from "a series of discontinuous discursive positions" (33).

Kim reproduces the paradigmatic adult-child dyad of cross-cultural knowledge-gathering and writing and in so doing destabilizes its enunciative process. The knowing adult, rather than establishing his authoritative distance and difference, alters his subject position in response to the charming child. The more fully hybridized Kim enjoys powers of access and pleasures of involvement that the Kipling narrator can only experience, as it were, vicariously. For this narrator, Kim, evidently, is both an object of imaginary identification and a site of desire. Kim provides an appealing image of freedom, of plenitude, of "being" not yet fully regimented in and by the Symbolic. Yet, at the same time, Kim may be said to embody the narrator's lack-of-being; the boy ostensibly experiences, lives, what the narrator merely observes and documents. Anthropologist Stephen Tyler notes that "ethnography can perform a therapeutic purpose in evoking a participatory reality," but emphasizes that "non-participatory textualization is alienation—"not us"—and there is no therapy in alienation" (128). If it is true that the narrator's representational mastery presupposes a certain degree of detachment or objectivity, it is also true that the figure of Kim tends to situate the experience of India elsewhere, outside and beyond the narrator's ken. Yet by aligning himself with Kim, by sporadically identifying with him, the narrator-ethnographer therapeutically restores himself, at least momentarily, to a subject position where knowledge and fulsome experience come together. The narrator must therefore vacillate back and forth between seeing and being, between the site of

authoritative, "objective" (but ultimately alienated) representation and the site of the restorative but unruly experience of involvement and cross-cultural identification.[17]

Quite apart from ethnographic considerations, however, the relationship between the adult who represents and the child who is represented is curiously and complexly fraught. In The Case of Peter Pan—a book that bears an alternative title, The Impossibility of Children's Literature—Jacqueline Rose argues that Freudian psychoanalysis, with its discovery of the unconscious, radically problematizes the traditional envisioning of the chronology of a human life. The unconscious undermines our claim to a stable, coherent identity, a unified self emerging out of a history it somehow transcends. After Freud, therefore, it becomes impossible to envision childhood merely as a temporary stage of the passage from infancy to adulthood. On the contrary, asserts Rose, "childhood is something in which we continue to be implicated and which is never simply left behind. Childhood persists . . . . It persists as something which we endlessly rework in our attempt to build an image of our own history"(12). This quest for coherent personal history and identity necessarily entraps us in a mirror-maze of representations—representations of the stable self we supposedly, wishfully, are, and representations of the child we were. Here again, the unconscious disrupts. As Rose points out,

> Language is not something which we simply use to communicate, as everything in psychoanalytic practice makes clear. Psychoanalysis directs its attention to what cannot be spoken in what is actually being said. It starts from the assumption that there is a difficulty in language, that in speaking to others we might be speaking against ourselves, or at least against that part of ourselves which would rather remain unspoken. (16)

---

[17]My focus here is upon the narrator's relationship with Kim. I do not intend to posit Kim as a pure site of being and belonging. As the first part of this chapter makes clear, Kim's engagement in the Great Game seriously compromises his insider status with respect to Indian culture and involves him in the same subjective dilemmas I now ascribe to the narrator.

The adult cannot therefore speak of or for the child from a position of representational mastery, because the boundary that separates the child from the adult is not clear-cut. Re-examined in the light of Freud's discovery of the unconscious, this boundary is no longer an "obviousness."

The question of representation in Kim is, however, further complicated by the fact that, within the imperial imagination, the figure of the child is intimately linked with representations of the colonial subject—ethnography's other. Two figures are caught up in a complex metonymy: to invoke the child is to invoke the colonial subject and vice versa. It is important, however, to recognize that the two terms are not exactly equivalent, that their relation tends to be metonymic rather than metaphorical. The play of similarity and difference characterizing their relation is precisely what allows the two terms to function within a discourse of domination: each term can be used to mediate and manage, to render meaningful and comprehensible, the speaking subject's relation with the other. The speaking subject, however, can also be drawn into the play of similarity and difference. To attempt, from the point of view of the adult, to represent the child and to attempt, as an involved ethnographer, to represent imperialism's cultural other, this is the doubly complex—Rose might say, doubly impossible—ambition enacted by Kipling's text. In his relation both with the child and with the cultural other, the Kipling narrator's claim to representational mastery is deeply compromised. In both cases, the boundary between the representing subject and the represented other reveals itself to be tenuous, uncertain. And, of course, the metonymic linkages between the two objects of representation redoubles the complexity of the undertaking, making it all the more difficult to manage.

Elucidation of these last points requires a return to the text of Kim, a close consideration of Kipling's project in process. Following an extensive and confidential discussion on the topic of the Great Game, Kim and Hurree Chunder Mookerjee take leave of each other: "Hurree Babu stepped back a pace or two into the crowd at the

entrance of Lucknow station—and was gone. Kim drew a deep breath and hugged himself all over" (184). What, one must ask, is the affective content of Kim's gesture? Adequate evaluation of that content demands, in my view, an appreciation of its ambivalence: the gesture is informed by joy and anxiety. Both of these affects are registered by Kipling's text, which evokes first, Kim's "glad rapture" (184), then, shortly after, "a sudden natural reaction" (185)—the boy's self-questioning and sense of self-alienation.

Certainly, Hurree is a potentially unsettling character, as his sudden uncanny disappearance testifies. He is enormously fat and yet his excess of flesh is like so much clay that he can mould to his will. He is a master of disguise, able to hoodwink even fellow spies (as he has earlier proved to Kim), a very slippery character—or rather "oily," to use Kipling's own oft-repeated adjective. The surface, the boundary, of his person is slick, elusive, ungraspable. Here Hurree melts into a crowd; elsewhere he stows about his body the various elements of a large intelligence trove, then transforms his entire aspect and demeanor, his very identity, while passing through a doorway. The Hurree Kipling has imagined possesses a liminal body, a liminal selfhood. And if there is evidently a certain joyful freedom in the experience and the experimentation of this liminality, yet one must recall that it is "glad rapture," the sudden seizure of the self by the Other. It may be apt to speak, therefore, of ecstasy, joyful self-alienation and self-loss, or of jouissance, an extreme, excessive pleasure that challenges and disrupts any claim to coherent self-sameness. Hurree is produced as an uncanny other and, as such, he is a potential site of anxiety. Manifestations of his liminal selfhood challenge any secure division between self and Other, any secure sense of an insular, individualized identity. Even Kim, who also knows the ecstatic pleasures of shape-shifting, becomes anxious. Kim, after all, is at this point a graduate of St. Xavier's. He has been schooled to a bounded British sense of self. He has become, rather like his creator, an Anglo-Indian, a divided subject

whose identity vacillates between contradictory assertions: "I am a sahib"; "I am not a sahib." As Hurree duly informs the boy, an unsupervised "half year of leave" is necessary "to make [Kim] de-Englishised" (184).

In the act of hugging himself, Kim discovers keys to his identity, which serve, at least momentarily, to reassure him:

> The nickel-plated revolver he could feel in the bosom of his sad-coloured robe, the amulet was on his neck; begging gourd, rosary, and ghost-dagger . . . were all to hand, with medicine, paint-box, and compass, and in a worn old purse belt embroidered with porcupine-quill patterns lay a month's pay. (201)

Kim's process of self-seeking immediately returns him to his "props"; he can recover himself only by taking stock. An assembly of disparate elements from diverse sources—weapons, cultural curios, scientific tools, money—Kim is the little bits of identity that others have given him. He is the product of an eclectic bricolage; his identity, it seems, can never be more than contingent. Self-hugging, then, performs a "suturing" of self, a joyful self-possession—"Yes! it's all mine, and I can hold it all together!"—and, at the same time, an anxious self-seeking—"Am I really here, in the tenuous linkages of all these disparate elements—tenuous linkages that I must constantly reassert, reconfirm?".

Kim now reposes the question he has posed before: "Who is Kim—Kim—Kim?". The narrator chooses, once again, to implicate himself in Kim's subjective process:

> A very few white people, but many Asiatics, can throw themselves into a mazement as it were by repeating their own names over and over again to themselves, letting the mind go free upon speculation as to what is called personal identity. When one grows older, the power, usually, departs, but while it lasts it may descend upon a man at any moment. (185)

The liminal identities of the adolescent and the colonial subject are thus brought into close association: the "power" of profound self-questioning pertains to "many Asiatics"; it usually diminishes or disappears "when one grows older." The narrator nonetheless implicates himself in Kim's bewilderment: maintaining a contemplative, almost confessional tone, he pushes to the limit his tacit claim to knowledge of Kim's interiority, implicitly affirming a personal, experiential understanding of the boy's crisis of identity. More than this, his reflections serve to generalize the import of Kim's question, opening up a radical interrogation of the concept of stable, definable selfhood, placing it, as it were, within dubious quotation marks—"what is called personal identity." Kim's question poses him as an enigma for himself, for the narrator, and for the readers of the text. There is evidently no exterior to the complex dynamic within which Kipling negotiates and experiments imperial subjectivities. In relation to the enigmatic Kim, Kipling poses the question of personal and cultural identity within a multicultural, imperial context and then leaves the question unresolved.

The recurring question—"Who is Kim?"—is never answered because it is unanswerable. It remains nonetheless the general question of Kim, a text that employs the hybrid boy, in a variety of ways, to make cultural distinctions and to posit cultural identities upon and in relation to those distinctions. As Judith Plotz points out, "By a genial touch 'Kim' means who in Turkish, so that 'who' is 'Kim' and 'Kim' is 'who.'" However, the unfortunate boy, "necessarily self-unknowing, 'knows no Turki'" (114). This canny reader's translation of "Kim" (a translation that neither the boy nor any other character within the text seems capable of performing) only serves, however, to further encrypt the mystery of identity. To ask "Who is Kim?" or, as the question is finally posed, "What is Kim?" (282), is now to ask who is who and what is who. It is to render uncertain any given personal identity and cultural identification. It is to recall

the radical and multiple indeterminacies that attend cultural hybridization in the contact zones of the empire.

Kipling's novel ultimately reinscribes rather than resolves the tensions that inform its progress, concluding, as it must, with the enunciation of two incommensurate promises: Kim is pledged to enlightenment and to an on-going imperial career, to service upon the Wheel and yet, at the same time, to freedom from it. As Mahbub rather facilely states the case, "now I understand that the boy, sure of paradise, can yet enter Government service" (285). Disciplined imperial endeavor and the quest for spiritual fulfillment and autonomy must continue their uneasy co-existence. The boy, still in the care of two partial and incompatible fathers, Mahbub and Teshoo Lama, is left suspended upon the brink of an impossible manhood.

As Sara Suleri astutely remarks, Kim's marvelous boyhood is unsurpassable. In a moment of muted tragedy buried in the very core of his text, "Kipling supplies a casual but crucial anticipation of the collapsibility of Kim" (127), fatefully linking the richness of Kim's gifts with the brevity of their duration: "[Kim's] quickness would have delighted an English master; but at St. Xavier's they know the first rush of minds developed by sun and surroundings, as they know the half-collapse that sets in at twenty-two or twenty-three" (Kim 124; qtd. in Suleri 127, with emphasis added). For Suleri, the figure of Kim "become[s] the image of the colonizer, but one that is elegiacally mourned in the passing of its prematurity" (129); the text of Kim becomes "an allegory of colonial education" (130), a life-education discovering "that in its adolescence is its end" (131). Kim's maturity, like that of the empire he is called upon to represent, must therefore be interminably deferred. The predicament implied by Kim's truncated Bildungs, his insuperable adolescence, mirrors the problem of imperial consolidation, mirrors with fair exactitude what Suleri describes as the British Empire's "prematurity" (as first anxiously intuited by Edmund Burke), its enduring "immaturity," which can never know an appropriate coming of age.

Kipling's Kim mutedly but unmistakably gives voice to an ethnographic "allegory of salvage." As Clifford argues, "allegories of salvage are implied by the very practice of textualization that is generally assumed to be at the core of cultural description. Whatever else an ethnography does, it translates experience into text." Ethnography is written against (and yet in tacit or explicit acknowledgement of) the ineluctable transience of "words and deeds":

> Since antiquity the story of the passage from the oral/aural into writing has been a complex and charged one. Every ethnography enacts such a movement, and this is the source of the peculiar authority that finds both rescue and irretrievable loss—a kind of death in life—in the making of texts from events and dialogues. ("Ethnographic" 115)

Typically, therefore, the ethnographer laments "the vanishing primitive" his text records, announces "the end of traditional society (the very act of naming it 'traditional' implies a rupture)" and the disappearance of its "object"—"the other [who] is lost, in disintegrating time and space, but saved by the text" (112). Typically, too, ethnography is informed by the assumption that "the other society is weak and 'needs' to be represented by an outsider (and that what matters in its life is its past, not present or future)" (113). The pertinence of the allegory of salvage for the reading of Kim is suggested by this novel's frequently fond and nostalgic tone and by its detailed evocation of a remembered world—the India of the 1880s, the India that, at the time of Kim's appearance in 1901, its author has not witnessed for ten changeful years. One can also find in the text occasional, explicit inscriptions acknowledging India's historical transformation: the narrator remarks upon "the mixture of old-world piety and modern progress that is the note of India to-day" (11), records various manifestations of "India in transition" (239). And indeed, as I noted earlier, the Great Game endeavors to preserve a timeless, changeless India; its relation with India is energized by an allegory of salvage.

Yet the India of Kim, as the salient presence of the Great Game confirms, is not so much archaic India as it is India under the Raj. It is the Raj during a period Spear characterizes as "The Imperial Heyday" (145ff.) that Kipling seeks to capture, to preserve against the inevitable violence of time. Kim, despite the considerable sustenance it offers to the imperial "illusion of permanence" (Hutchins), announces in its ethnography the passing of the Raj. Its assiduous efforts in the realm of cultural description assert a knowledge imperium, yet at the same time evidence an anxious desire to grasp and retain fugitive cultural realities; its narrative ultimately "occurs to confirm the precariousness of power" (Suleri 23). To read Kipling's novel as an imperial ethnography energized and informed by an allegory of salvage is to confirm that "the idiom of colonialism is necessarily proleptic: it must anticipate the transfer of power even in the articulation of the acquisition of power" (Suleri 21). Kim is the Raj's celebratory swan-song.

Kipling's Kim is an ethnographic text that can, in James Clifford's terms, "effectively implicate readers in the complex subjectivity of participant observation" (Predicament 33). My analysis, however, leads me to question the text's capacity to produce a coherent interpellation of its readers. This novel is not structured around a stable, continuous voice of authority. Similarly, it is difficult, in examining this work, to locate a secure place for the reader, a site of reception and interpretation where various meanings cohere. The novel stages diverse relations with the socio-cultural space called "India." Its narrator shifts position, vacillating between sympathetic involvement and authoritative detachment. Its central figure, Kim, is unmanageably multifarious—English yet Irish, native and sahib, an imperial agent and yet a Tibetan holy man's disciple. In my view, Kipling's novel cannot, with any easy certainty, be said to give voice to imperial authority. What it affirms much more clearly is "the first law of culture, which says that 'the more man controls anything, the more

uncontrollable both become'" (Tyler 123).[18] Kipling's empire and his Kim exceed and elude the controls that are brought to bear upon them; both escape toward what is, from Kipling's historical perspective, an unforeseeable, unrecognizable future, a future of postcolonial revisions that I attempted, at the beginning of this chapter, to evoke.

Returning, then, to the issues raised in my opening discussion of The English Patient and Kim, I observed that Ondaatje's novel presented, in relation to Kim, a parable of the practice of postcolonial reading, specifically the postcolonial reading of the colonial text. Employing Bhabha's critical theory, I suggested that The English Patient rearticulates Kim by situating it in "signifying relation to a disjunctive 'present'," by "staging" Kipling's tale "as symbol, myth, memory, history" and, at the same time, relocating it in "the very textuality of the present." Ondaatje's treatment thus employs Kim to offer a postcolonial "interrogation" of our "modernity" (Location 247). Furthermore, I argued that Ondaatje's Kip restages Kipling's marvelous hybrid boy and, in so doing, draws attention to a significant absence in Kim—the absence of explicit, unambiguous anti-imperial consciousness and action. I also proposed, however, that Kip, by making this absence present, completes the trajectory of Kipling's narrative representation of Kim and thus provides a postcolonial fulfillment of inchoate initiatives articulated in Kipling's text.

To press home these last points, I must note, first, that Kip's assumption of an active and intransigent, anti-European and anti-imperial stance is the direct result of a failure of identification: upon hearing news of the bombings at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the hybridized Kip discovers the impossibility of his continuing compliance

---

[18]Colonel Creighton, to and through whom a vast amount of ethnological and political information flows, comes very close to an imperial restatement of Tyler's "first law": "The more one knows about natives the less one can say what they will or won't do" (111).

with the European world system, of his continuing identification with the "Subject of Europe." It is here, precisely, in Kip's failure of identification, that I discover the problematizing trace of Kim. As my discussion of Kim has made clear, the hybrid boy's identifications trouble the application of disciplinary systems of domination and also, more radically, the production of imperial ethnography: Kim's tendency to identify with Indian collectives leads to disorderly circulation and proliferation of disciplinary power; Kipling's narrator's tendency to sporadically identify with the boy and assume the boy's identifications undermines the ethnographic authority of the text and, ultimately, the imperial project's authoritative, self-defining subject.

Although the Mowgli saga and the Stalky series both inscribe a culminating, consolidating moment of recognition and reciprocal identification that confirms the mutually sustaining relationship between the imperial subject and the hybrid protagonist, the text of Kim represents no such moment. It does, however, provide a scene that is structured like the key identificatory scenes of "In the Rukh" and "Slaves, Part II," but one which stages the problem of identification, not its resolution. I refer to the scene in which Kim's recruitment to the Great Game is to be confirmed by Creighton, if Creighton so decides.

Hearing Mahbub Ali negotiate with the British officer, Kim concludes that the wily Pathan, who had appeared not long before as his savior and deliverer, has now "sold [him] back to the English" (110)—an appraisal of the situation that is, in a certain sense, quite correct. The three characters, the hybrid boy, the colonial subaltern, and the British officer, are caught for a moment in a striking "freeze-frame":

> Kim beheld Mahbub Ali frying in flame for his treachery, but for himself he saw one long gray vista of barracks, schools, and barracks again. He gazed imploringly at [Mahbub's] clear-cut face in which there was no glimmer of recognition; but even at this extremity it never occurred to him to throw himself on the white man's mercy or to denounce the Afghan. And Mahbub

> stared deliberately at the Englishman, who stared as deliberately at Kim, quivering and tongue-tied. (109)

Here, the question "Who is Kim?" is posed in relation to another—"What will Kim become?". Both questions are articulated through the complex play of recognition and identification. Absent, however, is the specular symmetry of Mowgli's and Stalky's moments of imperial confirmation. Here, one confronts a triangular structure fraught with tension. Three subjects are held, transfixed, by the gaze of an other, a gaze that is in no case returned, in each case redirected: Kim looks at Mahbub, who looks at Creighton, who looks at Kim. The hybrid boy, in his moment of confusion, looks to the Pathan, the colonial subject, with whom he identifies, yet in whom he locates treachery, betrayal. The nature of this betrayal is perfectly rendered by Mahbub's gaze, which refuses recognition to Kim, which looks to and thus confirms the alien authority embodied in the imperial officer. Kim "sees" the treachery of collaboration. Mahbub's gaze, however, is not that of a humble sycophant. It challenges Creighton, interrogates his authority: Creighton, an authoritative figure in whom the text's disciplinary and ethnographic projects come together, is called upon to confirm his claim to authority by recognizing the value of Kim; the administrator-ethnologist must prove his capacity to discern Kim's special qualities, to discover the reality occulted by the unimpressive appearance of the regimental orphan.[19] Although the colonel succeeds in this trial of recognition (as is evidenced by his subsequent decision to

---

[19]The challenge enacted by Mahbub's gaze is unambiguously if indirectly rendered. In this scene, Mahbub offers Creighton both a horse and Kim. As he typically does, the Pathan horse-dealer metaphorizes Kim as a "pony." Creighton, who is clearly aware of the play of metaphor, hedges on both "purchases." Mahbub jeeringly responds, "The Sahib is a little hot and angry after riding . . . . Presently, he will see my horse's points more clearly" (110). Mahbub's duplicitous logic thus affirms, "If you know horses as you should, you will see the worth of my horse," and, at the same time, "If you know India as you should, you will appreciate the value of this boy."

"buy" the "pony," that is, to recruit Kim to the Game), he receives no reciprocal recognition from the hybrid boy, who experiences his gaze as a disconcerting, alien and unsympathetic "gaze of power," who feels his gaze but does not return it. Here then, the economy of gazing differs significantly from that which binds lupine Mowgli to Gisborne and Sikh Stalky to M'Turk: Kim's gaze includes Mahbub, the colonial subject, within the play of recognition and identification and, by so doing, excludes Creighton, who must now submit to the scrutinizing, interrogatory gaze of the Afghan.[20]

Three highly contingent subject positions are thus staged; as Kim, after some reflection, very perspicaciously concludes, "We be all on one lead-rope, . . . the colonel, Mahbub Ali, and I" (119). In this representation of interdependent subjectivities the problem of the imperial hybrid is revealed: the figure of the hybrid boy, when thoroughly and intensely examined, perturbs the play of the imperial power-Game and disrupts its production of an authoritative subject. It is precisely the problem of the hybrid, of the hybrid's identifications, that Ondaatje strains to the breaking point. In Kip is written the future of the marvelous, imperial hybrid, Kim,

---

[20]Of course, the narrative will subsequently signal Kim's nascent feeling of allegiance to Creighton and his willingness to identify with him. As with his interpretation of Mahbub's "betrayal," however, the change in Kim's perception of Creighton is ordered upon "systems of cultural recognition" (Slemon) peculiar to the hybrid boy: Mahbub's treachery resides in his free communication of a confidence to an outsider, an "alien" Englishman, in his revealing the secret identity that "sells" Kim to "the English"; Creighton recommends himself as "a man after [Kim's] own heart—a tortuous and indirect person playing a hidden game" (116). To impress Kim, the English colonel must find a place in the Imaginary economy of the casteless, mobile aficionado of intrigue, the street-bred orphan of Lahore. Kim's identification with Creighton is, moreover, both circumspect and partial. If Mahbub is content to acknowledge Creighton as a "bold and wise Colonel Sahib" (110), Kim, even after being submitted for a time to the "Englishising" influences of St. Xavier's, is still capable of a more than faintly contemptuous appraisal: "The Colonel is a servant of the government. He is sent hither and yon at a word, and must consider his own advancement" (135).

the postcolonial future of the boy who offers his precarious, contingent pledge of service to the Great Imperial Game.

Conclusion

In this study, I have returned to Kipling's imperial fictions of adolescence to discover the figure of the boy as deployed within Euro-imperialism's "consolidated vision" (Said), the vision available to the European subject during a historical period in which the socio-political reality of global domination mirrors itself most clearly, represents itself most fully and most confidently, in the realm of cultural production. The figure of the boy-protagonist is a crucial element in relation to whom Kipling articulates his envisioning (and his affirmation) of the British imperial project. Kipling's liminal "boy" represents an energizing yet carefully circumscribed process of transculturation in the contact zones of empire, asserting the imperial project's capacity to manage colonial alterity, to respond creatively and productively to the challenges posed by multifarious cultural contexts, by "heterogeneous cultures . . . yoked by violence" (Suleri 5). The figure, at once extraordinary and familiar, provides a pleasing, reassuring site of identification for the imperial imagination. As Mohanty affirms, Kipling's tales of boyhood "tell a distinct and specifiable political story in which adventure is indistinguishable from surveillance, pleasure is intertwined with power, and the values of childhood are but a thin allegory of imperial ideology" ("Drawing" 326). Kipling's "boy," far from being merely a figure of fantasy and facile wish-fulfillment, engages ever more intimately and intensely with the business of empire. To follow, moreover, the trajectory of the Kipling "boy" from the Mowgli saga through Stalky to Kim is to witness the figure's movement from the relatively remote and isolated margin to the centre-stage of the Eastern empire.

Yet, as I have repeatedly affirmed, the British empire's time of confidence is also its time of anxiety, of doubt and self-questioning, and this paradoxical disposition manifests itself in Kipling's treatment of the "empire boy." Posing the figure of the boy as a site of critical inquiry for both colonial and postcolonial cultural studies, my

thesis situates Kipling in a period marked by the consolidation and destabilization of the modern empires. Kipling's rendering of the "boy" manifests and confirms an imperial world-view, yet raises, at the same time, some of the key questions orienting initiatives of contemporary postcolonial criticism and theory. Sustained analysis reveals the figure's overdetermination and, ultimately, a susceptibility to the breakdown and collapse that is literally inscribed in the text of Kim. Envisioned complexly and intensively as a hybrid subject and engaged ever more intimately with the "real business" of empire, Kipling's "boy" takes shape as a highly ambivalent figure who serves yet disrupts, asserts yet subverts, imperial authority and ideology, providing a significant literary manifestation of the hybridity of the colonial signifier and of the inescapable ambivalence of the discourse of empire. In various ways, Kipling's treatment of the "boy" opens up new possibilities for a deconstructive, decolonizing critique of British imperialism's cultural legacy.

As my "Introduction" announces, one of my orienting critical concerns has been European imperialism's production of a strategically divided world, a world envisioned Eurocentrically and discursively distributed in subordinate relation to "Europe" or "the West." Against this mapping of the modern globe as an assembly of distinct, differently empowered cultural zones, I put forward a critique guided by a notion of "transculturation" (Pratt)—the reciprocal transformation of the cultures imperial expansion brings into protracted confrontation. Following Spivak's example, I posit a "Subject of Europe" that constitutes itself in its representations of its cultural Other, that constitutes itself in representations of the various "other worlds" constituted by a European imperial enterprise of global proportions. The study of Kipling, whom I consider as a complexly representative voice of late nineteenth-century British imperial culture, enables specific, detailed examination of such self-constituting representations of cultural alterity. As I observe, moreover, Kipling's work registers a singularly important cultural confrontation, that which opposes yet binds together Britain and

India, historically and culturally. Exemplifying a post-Mutiny consciousness, an imperial consciousness in crisis, Kipling functions as a reassuring myth-maker for a British empire that must consolidate itself in the face of contradiction, contestation, and resistance. Accompanying, however, the enunciation of enduring faith and confidence in the British imperial mission is the more muted acknowledgement of anxiety and uncertainty. Accompanying the affirmation of the cultural superiority and difference, which sets British and Indian cultures apart and at odds, which justifies and sustains the British imperial intervention, is the acknowledgement of an irresistible, reciprocal process of transculturation or hybridization—a process of which Kipling and his fictions are noteworthy products. In his "empire boy," Kipling inscribes both the confidence and the anxiety of post-Mutiny British imperialism in India, envisioning youthful, enterprising, imperial protagonists who, as sites of circumscribed transculturation, represent "a borderline position that incorporates, polarizes, dialogizes, and bridges the worlds of colonizer and colonized, . . . [of] England and India" (Sullivan 126), a mediating position bearing the promise of symbolic resolution of the ambivalencies and contradictions that inhere in the world-view of a writer whose cultural sympathies and identifications are radically divided.

As the "Introduction" indicates, Kipling's staging of imperial enterprise by the mediation of the "boy" is not to be understood as an isolated and eccentric case, but rather as a consolidating cultural intervention, one that draws upon and rearticulates a quite varied and complex array of cultural precedents, one that enunciates, for Kipling's time and for our own, an imperial envisioning of the nature and meaning of boyhood. The adolescent protagonist who reconfigures the terms and meanings of cross-cultural encounter and thus confirms a Eurocentric imaginative domination of the space and subjectivity of the Other, has, as I contend, an extensive genealogy, which includes but is by no means limited to Kipling's "empire boy."

From his first emergence as a distinct, recognizable figure within the social text of early modern Europe, the "boy" is enmeshed in issues of social differentiation and hierarchization. Both as "specialized child" and as the focal, representative subject-in-process of a civilizing process, the figure of the boy participates intimately in the reorganization and rearticulation of modern European societies. Furthermore, he early evidences his sense-making function in relation to the encounter of expanding European "civilization" with the "uncivilized" cultural Other. Rousseau clearly differentiates the male "child" from the female and closely associates the former with the "primitive" Carib and with Defoe's Crusoe, the prototype of the European colonial adventurer. His deployment of Émile begins to manifest the instrumentality of the "boy" in the making and maintaining of an "allochronic" perspective upon the cultures of the Other. Non-European cultures are assigned to an "earlier" time in relation to European contemporaneity, the time of the "primitive" or, after Burke and specifically with respect to India, that perhaps more troubling time, the "archaic." Burke, as I maintain, establishes the "boy" as an imperial protagonist, but invokes a "boy" who troubles the conception of both the time of colonial India and the time of British imperialism, a "boy"-imperialist whose youthful impetuosity and irresponsibility offends against aged sublimity. Between Burke's and Kipling's imperial "boy" in India I locate two crucial developments: first, Mill's and Macaulay's xenophobic, defamatory depiction of an atrophied, malevolent Indian "archaic"—a conception of India that the Mutiny will later confirm in the British popular consciousness; secondly, the rise of school and adventure literatures of the "boy," which recuperate the figure Burke had so eloquently tarnished, offering the "empire boy" as an ideal representative of the imperial mission.

Kipling, as the chapters on The Jungle Books, Stalky & Co., and Kim reveal, makes full use of his cultural patrimony in his validation and consolidation of the key values, themes, and concepts informing an imperial vision of boyhood. Although his writings represent "a cultural self constructed during decades that saw radical revisions

in European understanding of the identity of the subject, of gender, the psyche, the child, and the 'native'" (Sullivan 127), Kipling's repeated inscription of the "boy" at the centre of narratives of empire re-enforces the envisioning of European imperialism as masculine endeavor and arranges structuring, sense-making categories—the subject, the child, the "native"—according to a masculinist perspective. As I also demonstrate, however, Kipling's portrayal of the "boy" conforms to, and draws sustenance from, a masculinist bias within childhood's European history, one that is instituted in childhood's specialization and is confirmed, most notably, in Rousseau's highly influential pedagogical philosophy. Kipling's "boy," invariably representing a liminal subject-in-process, is deployed, like Ariès's specialized child, in contingent relation with various others whose subject positions are, by that very relation, fixed and established. Around the liminal "boy," both imperial and colonial subjects are distinguished, distributed, and hierarchized. The subjectivities and spaces of the cultural Other are thus "mapped" as the "territory" of a consolidated imperium. Kipling locates in the figure of the boy, as did Rousseau, a special capacity to organize the (Eurocentric) representation of the relationship between imperial Europe and its colonial cultural Other. In his deployments of the figure, Kipling adheres to a well-established notion of a "time" of the Other distinct from, and earlier than, that of modern Europe, placing his "empire boy" in relations of (often shifting and unstable) peerage with much more mature and experienced "native" characters and, also, establishing the figure in aggressive, antagonistic (Mowgli) or fond, protective (Kim) relation with manifestations of the Indian "archaic." Kipling follows Burke in envisioning British imperialism in India as a "boyish" enterprise. However, where Burke, in contemplating the question of colonial India, had perceived a problem of imperial mismanagement, Kipling, from his post-Mutiny perspective, perceives a problem for imperial management. Sustained in his initiative by a prodigiously productive half-century of empire-affirming, school and adventure narratives of the

"boy," Kipling refashions the figure Burke had construed as British imperialism's inept intruder as an efficient imperial agent, one who mediates cultural difference and renders it malleable to imperial purposes.

Intervening in the massive visual and literary reproduction of "the British Empire" that characterizes late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century British popular culture, Kipling creates "synthetic world orders" (Sullivan 179) inhabited by his various specimens of imperial boyhood. Once situated in his imaginary realm—Mowgli's "Jungle," the "Coll." of Stalky and company, Kim's marvelously accessible, mythic and libidinized "India"—the "boy" represents the possibility of staging imperial subjectivity coherently, in relation to both Imaginary and Symbolic orders of experience. Kipling's fictions of imperial adolescence provide abundantly the Imaginary gratifications of adventurous self-discovery, self-testing, and self-assertion amongst admiring cohorts and persistent, energetic, often thrillingly dangerous, but never indomitable adversaries. The worlds of Kipling's "boy," however, also manifest a complex Symbolic dimension—the Jungle Law, the "official" and the delinquent codes of the "Coll.", the Great Game—in relation to which the young protagonist must define and situate himself. Most notably by the adept manipulation of modes of Imaginary and Symbolic identification, Kipling strives to strike a balance between the typically contrary demands of the two orders of subjective experience.
Notwithstanding this drive to co-ordinate the Imaginary and the Symbolic, Kipling's imperial fictions, as Sullivan observes, almost invariably entail "the splitting of the self and its empire into the private or Imaginary, and the public or the Symbolic" (179). In the fictions of adolescence, the "empire boy"'s capacity to provide a site for both private and fully communal identification, for the inscription of both self-affirming fantasies and shared meanings and values, is compromised and perturbed by the hybridity, the cultural liminality and indeterminacy, of the figure.

Lupine Mowgli, as my examination of The Jungle Books demonstrates, is a hybrid whose allegorical Bildung refashions imperial story and history—most notably and specifically, the story and history of the Indian insurrection of 1857. As I make clear in a brief analysis of a scene from Kim, Kipling's allegorical restagings of Mutiny scenes are sense-making maneuvers, attempts to symbolically manage troubling, refractory aspects of Mutiny history. The hybrid adolescent of The Jungle Books overcomes the antipathy and resistance his difference inspires both in the jungle and the village, progressing through partial and selective assimilation to the domination and mastery that allows for the mapping of both his alternative worlds as spaces of imperial action and endeavor, advancing irresistibly toward the magical resolution of Imaginary and Symbolic imperial identifications that is proleptically articulated in "In the Rukh." Invoking and resolving, by means of allegorical indices, the scenes and situations of the Mutiny, Kipling's jungle saga reconfigures that highly disruptive historical moment as an ultimately undaunting given of Mowgli's Bildung and, by extension, as "a datum in the life-story of the Empire" (Guha). The Mowgli saga, however, allegorically recapitulates more than it transforms the Mutiny story upon which it is posited: despite the capacity to negotiate differences that Mowgli's liminality implies, the boy resolves antagonistic encounters by acts of violence, which signal the Mutiny's status as the limit-text of pro-imperial myth-making. Ultimately, the Mutiny scenario is not assimilated to but eradicated from Kipling's allegorical rendering of the "triumphant" story of British imperialism in India.

If Mowgli does not display, to the same degree as Stalky or, better still, Kim, a talent for the negotiation and manipulation of cultural difference, it is due in large part to his status as a displaced site of hybridization. Although my study considers that Kipling's "boy," in every case, relocates, reconfigures, and renegotiates issues of British-Indian encounter, it is important to recognize that both the wolf-boy and his divided world constitute thoroughly displaced sites of colonial cross-cultural

confrontation and hybridization: Mowgli's two antithetical worlds are not "Britain" and "India," but India as "jungle" and "village"; the liminal place of Mowgli's subjectivity is not articulated between British and Indian cultures, nor even between the jungle society and the Indian society of the village, but between the feral and the human. (As the jungle denizens repeatedly affirm, the jungle boy will hear and ultimately must heed the call of "Man"—the culturally unmarked sign of species.) In the tales of Mowgli's childhood and adolescence, the British, as I have remarked, constitute a presence so vague and distant as to be effectively an absence. Yet even the treatment of Indian characters and of village society evidences their peculiar lack of presence. Relatively prominent Indian characters such as Buldeo and even Mowgli's eventual father-in-law, Abdul Gafur, are shaped by the discursive violence of what Bhabha calls the colonial "stereotype," which denies them serious consideration by rendering their individuality in predictable and generalizable terms: in both of these characters one recognizes the entirely unsurprising image of the cowardly, superstitious, duplicitous Indian "native." Even Messua (whose special status in Mowgli's world resides in the "natural" affiliation of mother and son) is "woman" more crucially and more clearly than she is the "Indian mother." Not sympathy but antipathy characterizes Mowgli's relations with other villagers—excepting, of course, his human father, to whom he seems indifferent. Neither villagers nor village can assert effective presence in Mowgli's little world. When, in the end, the jungle is "let in," the tenuousness of the village's claim to status as specific, differentiated, socio-cultural space is made perfectly clear. The place of "the British" in the Mowgli saga of The Jungle Books is left largely undefined; whereas, the place of Indian culture is effaced, literally and with chilling finality, by a signal act of violence.

Of course, Mowgli, the young adult, eventually takes an Indian bride. However, the synchronous, interdependent deployment of marriage and recruitment in "In the Rukh" configures this action as an initiation to British imperial order rather than to

Indian society. Mowgli, as I have said, takes up his humanity by identifying with the Empire and, by becoming at the same time, a site of imperial identification. Only imperial recognition can confer human status upon feral Mowgli. Gisborne, moreover, recognizes Mowgli as Master of the Jungle, not as a representative of Indian society. Gafur sees not a "fellow" and likely son-in-law, but a wood-demon. Although Mowgli facilitates the mapping of the imperial project onto an allegorized India composed of "jungle" and "village," he does not represent a meeting place or point of contact for British and Indian cultures. Kipling's jungle saga never directly acknowledges the process of transculturation—the very process that makes a figure like hybrid Mowgli imaginable—as an aspect of British-Indian cross-cultural engagement. This series of allegorical tales is so deeply informed by the Mutiny trauma that it can only represent a radically displaced hybridity, one that has no immediately recognizable reference to shared cultural history and actuality, one that evokes but never directly refers to the intensely troubling issue of post-Mutiny British-Indian encounter.

Kipling's rendering of Mowgli does, however, signal the allegorical significance of the "empire boy," the "boy" who, in each of the three cases I examine, stages the formation of an imperial subject for the Indian empire. Similarly, the case of Mowgli saliently reveals that the hybrid "boy" is a site of displacement for imperial subjectivity, a contained, controlled site where the hybridization of that subjectivity can be acknowledged and enablingly deployed: feral Mowgli commands the jungle to the service of the Empire; in the guise of a Sikh, Stalky stages an affirmative resolution of British imperial ventures; Kim, as "white" Indian boy, serves within, and ultimately must justify, the complex system of post-Mutiny British imperial order in India. Mowgli, like Stalky and Kim, discovers in hybridization the path to power. At the same time, however, Mowgli's experience of hybridity registers, in a few noteworthy moments, an "identity crisis" provoked by the splitting of the boy's group identification. Although such crisis is absent from the treatment of British-bred,

partially hybridized Stalky, it is a salient element in Kipling's overall characterization of Kim.

In Stalky & Co., Stalky's cultural hybridization coincides with and, in large part, accounts for his accession to a position of power and privilege in the contact zone of the Indian empire. The effects of this hybridization are, however, curtailed and contained by an essentialized, racialized conception of subjective and cultural difference, by the drawing of "the color line" (Mohanty). Having undertaken a protracted deterritorialization of the imperial world order, Kipling then follows with a sudden startling reterritorialization. In Kipling's representation of the "Coll." at Westward Ho!, the various imperial practices of the "stalky" schoolboy effectively destabilize and subvert the public-school code elaborated in earlier school fictions—most notably, in Tom Brown's Schooldays—opening up the relatively insular, distinctively British "world of school" to the broader influences of the British empire. In the process, the Symbolic order of the school and of that empire is reconfigured: Kipling's school tales challenge the organizing ideological distinction between the metropolitan centre and the colonial periphery, thus enabling a new, more integrated envisioning of British imperial actuality, an envisioning of an "Empire" composed of various analogous spaces of struggle and endeavor, inhabited by various analogous subjectivities; the text of Stalky represents an imperial world in which autonomous cultural unities, such as "the British school" or, more broadly, "the British nation," no longer exist, a world of hybridized cultures and subjects. Yet Kipling does not entirely abandon the centre/periphery paradigm, as one discovers when the representative of British imperial boyhood arrives upon the scene of colonial India. The inscription of agency, as active and intransigent resistance to constituted authority, serves finally to distinguish the British schoolboy and the metropolitan school from their erstwhile analogues, the colonial subject and the colonial territory.

As I also point out, however, the final rendering of the boyish British officer as Sikh does pose the problem of the imperial hybrid, of British-Indian transculturation. Even as the broader reality of empire had earlier written itself upon the metropolitan schoolboy, so the culture of the Indian Other writes itself—now more thoroughly, more unmistakably—upon the imperial subject in the contact zone. Stalky introduces but does not yet explore the key topic of Kim; the hybridity of Stalky's imperial subjectivity is evoked rather than extensively examined. Part two of "Slaves" registers the hero's liminal cultural placement, but does not reflect upon the complex subjective implications of such placement, nor upon the socio-cultural and political agency of such a subject.

Although a color line is drawn on page one of Kim, its enunciation, as I have remarked, is both peremptory and strangely fraught with qualifications: Kim is "white" (despite his sun-blackened skin), is "English" (although his acculturation is decidedly "un-English," although English is the unmastered tongue of this otherwise extremely impressive juvenile polyglot). As this peculiar enunciative maneuvering suggests, the color line is drawn, here, not to elude the troubling complexities of the cultural and subjective hybridization, but to initiate a controlled, circumscribed meditation upon them. Within an encompassing framework informed by panoptical, administrative disciplines and ethnological documentation, Kim stages—as Stalky does not—the multidimensional, often ambivalent agency of the radically hybridized imperial subject.

I open the Kim chapter with a discussion of The English Patient to confront, albeit briefly, the questions raised by the postcolonial appropriation and transformation of the legacy of the imperial "boy." The English Patient stages, at the literal level, a rereading of Kipling's text that displaces it in relation to a cultural moment significantly different than that of its original production. Ondaatje returns to Kim as an ambivalent colonial text that can be made to serve within a deconstructive

interrogation of the hybridized subject's relationship with modern, Eurocentric systems of power-politics. Apprehending with sudden clarity the exacerbated untenability of this relationship, Kip, a transfigured Kim, turns the defiling Enfield upon the "Englishman" and thus assumes the rebel posture of 1857. Kip, however, does not fire the gun, because his enemy, the European imperial subject, has already been destroyed, already been burned beyond recognition by global conflagration. Ondaatje's postcolonial fiction draws attention to an absence in Kim, the absence of intransigent, self-conscious opposition to the imperial world system, but also suggests the possibility of turning Kipling's text against itself, the possibility of finding within this empire-affirming fiction the half-acknowledged indices of the British imperial project's eventual undoing. For Ondaatje, clearly, the hybridized subject is a key site for the articulation of decolonizing initiatives. I therefore undertake a reading of Kim that focuses upon the role of the hybrid boy, who maneuvers within the "gap" post-Mutiny ideology opens between British and Indian cultures, who, as the crucial, mediating link, enables, yet also potentially disrupts, the functioning of two distinctly modern, ostensibly objective and disengaged power-systems—administrative panopticism and ethnological science.

In the first part of the Kim chapter, I argue that the hybrid boy is situated within British imperial order not as a subject under the law but as one acted upon by disciplinary mechanisms in relation to which he must discover both his subjection and his agency. Fatherless, as Mowgli and Stalky effectively are, Kim is taken up, as are his predecessors, by various surrogate fathers, partial fathers. In Kim's case, fatherlessness is very closely associated with an absence or ineffectiveness of lawful constraints. The inscription of the name of the father is held in suspension, deferred. Kim, moreover, unlike Mowgli, never discovers in any of his father-surrogates one who can articulate for him a binding law: the lama presents a mystic law, but one to which the boy never more than half-heartedly subscribes; Mahbub, Creighton, and

Lurgan, although all three appear at times in the guise of the father, represent a socio-political system that, if not pointedly illegal, is certainly not lawful. Kim progresses from the illicit Zam-Zammah game to the secret, not-quite-lawful Great Game without any definitive transformations of the personal characteristics, dispositions, and propensities that mark him, from the outset, as potentially delinquent. Indeed, as Kim's education under Lurgan clearly shows, the representatives of the Great Game aim to develop and mobilize the secretiveness, the appetite for intrigue, the surreptitious watchfulness, the opportunistic adoption of disparate social locations or "identities"—all the dubious distinguishing marks of the street-bred urchin. Evaluated from the disciplinary perspective, Kim appears not as a problem or impediment but as a potent, productive instrument of socio-political order under the Raj. By learning to pursue his pleasures in the service of the imperial cause, Kim is able to fulfill the destiny foreshadowed by his early role as the startlingly unlikely representative of British power and authority in the allegorical Zam-Zammah game. Kim manifests himself, as the novel progresses, as a triumphant manifestation of British imperialism's capacity to discipline, subordinate, and mobilize, to partially and selectively incorporate, the marginal, potentially disruptive elements of the colonial social body. Under Kim's alert and avid eye, India becomes an administered space inhabited by a catalogued multiplicity of controlled, docile subjects.

As I suggest at the end of my argument's first movement, however, the mobilization of hybrid Kim within imperial disciplinary systems entails certain liabilities. The analysis of Kim's mimicking representation of the British Commander-in-Chief reveals the potentially perturbatory effects of multivalent, ultimately undecidable ethnicity upon disciplinary systems of social control. Cultural hybridization, which Kipling's novel registers in its representation of Kim and his Great Game cohorts, complicates disciplinarization by creating mobile subjects whose cultural identification is unstable and whose agency is therefore politically uncertain.

Kim's performance obscures imperialism's power divide by deploying the disciplinary power of the Raj in ways that submit it to disorderly proliferation. Significantly, invocations of the Mutiny frame the performance. Here, as in the time of the Mutiny, politically volatile information circulates as rumor within Indian collectives.

Ethnography, I contend, is the supplementary "discipline" Kipling employs in his attempt to contain the disruptive energies of transculturation and the hybrid subject it produces. Ethnography as power-knowledge is inscribed at the level of the énoncé in the early representation of the Lahore Museum and, later, in the ethnological concerns Creighton and Hurree Babu bring to the Great Game. The Museum, in particular, orients the reading of Kipling's India by submitting it to categorization and spatial distribution, by presenting a multifaceted "Orient" that is meaningfully ordered by Western knowledge. The Museum's deployment of "all India"—past and present—in synchronic suspension offers itself as a paradigm for Kipling's overall treatment of subcontinental culture, which isolates India from its dynamic history and confronts "timeless" Indian culture as a text susceptible to the informed, authoritative decoding and interpretation of a Western observer. Like the knowledge production of the Great Game, the ethnographic treatment of India renders it as fully knowable and controllable. Kim, as the rogue element who freely traverses the bounded spaces of Indian society, brings a subjective, fully participatory perspective to the representation of the cultural Other. At the same time, however, Kim's free-wheeling, transgressive experience of India constitutes the exception that confirms the rule: he marks the boundaries he tests, the boundaries that reflect, moreover, not so much the immanent forms of Indian social structure but the organizational categories imposed by Western Indology. The boy's antic freedom maps India as Indology's subdivided, stratified, essentially static culture.

Notwithstanding the hybrid boy's various recommendations as an instrument of imperial ethnography—recommendations that include, notably, his supposed affinity (as

"boy") with the "Neverland" of the "eternal East," his "putatively innocent eye" (Krupat), his capacity to occupy and negotiate a middle ground between colonizer and colonized, his production of an insider perspective—I nonetheless characterize Kim as an ambivalent subject and a potential site of resistance. Considering, first, Kim's typically insubordinate relationship with authority, I subsequently examine his relationship with Kipling's narrator, the site of ethnographic authority and the subject of ethnographic enunciation. The boy who experiences and the narrator who observes and records constitute together the ethnographic apparatus of Kipling's text. The narrator, upon examination, reveals himself to be, rather like Kim, a shifting, unstable textual figure, whose language is hybrid, whose enunciative register vacillates between authoritative detachment and affectively inflected, sympathetic engagement and identification with the culture of study. Frequently forsaking the totalizing voice of ethnographic authority, the narrator sees and experiences from the hybrid boy's perspective. The boy, an object and an instrument of representation, becomes a site of identification, a site that implicates the narrator in the complex interplay of imperial and colonial subjectivities. Both as adult subject representing the child and as ethnographic, imperial subject representing the colonial, cultural other, the narrator cannot finally maintain his position of representational mastery, as I demonstrate by analyzing a scene that engages Kim, Hurree, and the narrator in the subjectively unsettling, textual play of similarity and difference, of the familiar and the uncanny. Writing the other and, by extension, writing India as the cultural Other are thus revealed as highly contingent negotiations of imperial representation, as writings of the subjectivity of the speaker and of the Subjectivity (of "Europe," of "the West") that authorizes and sustains his speech. The key question, "Who is Kim?", must, I therefore affirm, be read as a radical interrogation of the subject and Subject constituted in and by the imperial project. Finding that the text poses but does not, cannot, resolve Kim's question, I locate in it the enunciative instance that enables a

deconstruction of Kipling's dream-vision of an ideal Indian empire. The alluring yet unsettling figure of the hybrid adolescent (who cannot identify himself, who cannot be identified) confounds the ideology of cultural difference upon which the post-Mutiny Raj is founded, collapses the binary, oppositional formulation of the British imperial subject and the Indian colonial, of a sovereign "West" and a subordinate "East." In Kim's undefinable and insuperable adolescence, in his cultural hybridity, which post-Mutiny ideology can only apprehend as an aspect of adolescent liminality, is written the end of the British imperial "illusion of permanence" (Hutchins). In Kim, I therefore conclude, Kipling's ethnographic discourse takes shape as an "allegory of salvage" (Clifford), which celebrates the Raj yet acknowledges the inevitability of its passing.

The figure of the imperial adolescent thus eludes the containing grasp of both the disciplinary, administrative, imperial machine and the ethnographic science that supplements its powers. Kim's destabilization of the powers that play upon him is, in both cases, an effect of his hybrid ethnicity. In the figure of Kim imperial subjectivity discovers itself in contingent relation with colonial subjectivity and British imperial culture acknowledges the disruptive productivity of its encounter with India.

In this thesis, I have tried to discover in the analysis of the "empire boy" a way of interrogating the "authoritative subjectivity produced in the colonizing process," a way of re-evaluating the role of "the process of identification in the negotiations of cultural politics" (Bhabha, Location 233). Imperial subjectivity—the subjectivity constituted by the British imperial project, in and by the cross-cultural confrontations that project necessarily entails—does not, in Kipling's fictions of the "boy," manifest its deep and dependable "embeddedness" in the culture of the British "homeland," but rather its highly contingent, indeterminate formation upon the limen that emerges between the cultures of imperial "home" and the colonial "outland." Indeed, as the fictions I have considered make abundantly clear, the formation of subjects in an imperial world is not

to be understood, simply and unambiguously, in terms of discrete socio-cultural spaces and identities. Kipling's "boy" situates himself between cultures in confrontation, manifests himself upon "an ambivalent borderline of hybridity" (Bhabha, Location 208). The experience of the hybridized "empire boy" represents, quite precisely, "a contingent borderline experience [that] opens up in-between colonizer and colonized" (206). Produced to negotiate and sustain the sharply drawn, Post-Mutiny distinction that opposes British colonizer to Indian colonized, Kipling's "boy" nonetheless calls this same clear-cut binary formulation into question. The imperial figure of the boy must be read, like Bhabha's Mutiny chapati, as a "hybrid sign," in this case, as the sign of an imperial subject marked by the trace of the colonial other. As such, the figure occupies "a space of cultural and interpretive undecidability" (Location 206)—an undecidability Kipling writes, very tellingly, as "adolescence."

Kipling consistently represents adolescent liminality in intimate, seemingly interdependent relation with cultural hybridization: the tales of wolf-boy, Mowgli, displace this relation and render it allegorically; the treatment of the schoolboy, at once little savage and little imperialist, re-enunciates the imaginative association of adolescence and hybridity even before the presentation of Stalky as boyish British officer and Sikh; in the figure of Kim, the experiences of adolescence and of cultural hybridity are intertwined to such a degree that both find their summary enunciation in the inevitable question, "Who is Kim?". Kipling figures the transculturation of the imperial subjectivity as an adolescence and, in so doing, articulates the subjective register of the post-Mutiny, imperial "crisis of consolidation" (Stokes). Here resides, in my view, the special importance of Kipling's contribution to cultural productions of the "empire boy." The boy who mediates an envisioning of imperial subjectivity also, by that very mediation, dislocates and displaces that subjectivity, opening a bounded, authoritative "self" to "adolescent" doubt and self-questioning. If Kipling's boy-protagonists invariably serve "the Empire" energetically and productively, yet they also

introduce "adolescent problems" to the imperial enterprise. The adolescent (especially the hybrid adolescent) is uncertain as to his socio-cultural identifications. Rather than embodying constituted authority, he is more typically at odds with it. If he shapes his world, he is also shaped by it; if he defines his others, he is also defined by them. The election of the hybrid adolescent as a representative subject of the British imperial project signals a destabilization, by the force of crisis, of that project's foundational assumptions and premises. It attests to uncertainty about self-sovereignty and authority at the individual and the cultural level, about the place, power, and meaning of the Other (which constitutes and defines the cultural Subject that constitutes and defines it). It articulates an "identity crisis" of British imperial culture.

Kipling's representations of the "empire boy" intervene in unsettling ways in the imaging of an empowered, self-sovereign and authoritative imperial subject, thus constituting a disruption of the ideology that sustains both that subject and the empire of which he is a representative. The cultural production of the "boy" as a principal representative of the British imperial enterprise constitutes a figurative displacement in the self-representation of the imperial subject. The organizing subject of this enterprise is effectively refigured: the massive production of imperial fictions of the "boy" remake an authoritative, self- and other-determining, masculine subject as a liminal, contingent "adolescent." Although Kipling is by no means alone in narrating imperial boyhood and its empire, his fictions deserve special attention because they manifest clearly, complexly, and in detail the tensions and perturbations troubling imperial ideology and subjectivity, tensions and perturbations which are also, already evidenced, but usually only tacitly, in the more general cultural production of the "empire boy." Unlike a Ballantyne or a Henty, Kipling not only registers but represents the forces of

disruption that initiate and impel the constitution of the "boy" as the British empire's representative protagonist.[1]

As I have repeatedly suggested, Kipling's narratives of imperial adolescence intervene in and transform the signifying practices of post-Mutiny British imperial discourse and ideology. To consider, as I have done, the decades following the 1857 Mutiny as a period of cultural, ideological crisis is to appreciate the full force of contradiction informing the confrontation of post-Mutiny isolationist and separatist ideology with the unignorable fact of cultural hybridization, which two centuries of cross-cultural encounter must necessarily entail. Registering this crisis and responding creatively to it, Kipling reproduces yet significantly transforms the "boy" of his cultural patrimony: Kipling's "empire boy" becomes not simply a "hybrid sign" forged in the press of cultures in agonistic confrontation, but indeed the very sign of cultural hybridization, the figure allowing for (partial) acknowledgement and controlled, delimited representation of transculturation in the contact zones of the Indian empire. As my criticism has repeatedly emphasized, however, Kipling's deployments of the "boy" do not negotiate post-Mutiny crisis of consolidation with an entire success. As a

---

[1]My concluding remarks, here, are indebted to "Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography," Gayatri Spivak's introduction to Selected Subaltern Studies. Spivak affirms, in this essay, that the most significant achievement of the Subaltern Studies group resides in its collective elaboration of a theory of cultural, political, historical change. Subaltern historiography and cultural studies, in Spivak's view, is consistently ordered upon the conviction that "the moment(s) of change" must be "plotted as confrontations rather than as transitions" and "seen in relation to histories of domination and exploitation" (3). She finds that the group's scholarship demonstrates, moreover, that socio-cultural "changes are signalled or marked by a functional change in sign-systems" (3), changes that "can only be articulated by the force of a crisis" (4). Cultural crisis provokes, and is articulated by, "discursive displacements" (5). Applying Spivak's theoretical evaluation of Subaltern Studies scholarship to my own distinct critical project, I would affirm that the imperial figure of the boy marks a "site of displacement of the function of signs" (4-5) provoked by an imperial crisis of consolidation.

hybrid figure whose cultural identifications are split, Kipling's "boy" offers ambivalent service to the discourse of late nineteenth-century British imperialism in India. If Kipling's representations of boyhood confirm and consolidate the "boy" as an imperial figure for an "Age of Empire" (Hobsbawm), they also signal the fissuring impact of colonial, cross-cultural confrontation upon British imperial subjectivity and upon the imaging of the imperial enterprise.

Works Cited

Abellán, Jose Luis. "Los Orígenes Españoles del Mito del 'Buen Salvaje'. Fray Bartolomé de las Casas y su Antropología Utópica." Historia Crítica del Pensamiento Español. (Tomo II.) Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1979.

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays. Trans. Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971.

Arata, Stephen D. "A Universal Foreignness: Kipling in the Fin-de Siècle." English Literature in Transition (1880-1920), 36.1 (1993): 7-38.

Ariès, Philippe. Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life. New York: Knopf, 1962.

Asad, Talal. "The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology." Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Eds. James Clifford and George E. Marcus. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986.

Baden-Powell, R. S. S. Scouting For Boys: A Handbook for Instruction in Good Citizenship. London, 1908.

Ballantyne, R. M. The Coral Island. Puffin: London, 1982.

Barrie, J. M. Peter Pan. Puffin: London, 1982.

Besant, Walter. "Is it the Voice of the Hooligan?". The Contemporary Review LXXVII (January 1900): 27-39.

Bhabha, Homi K. The Location of Culture. London: Routledge, 1994.

---. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." October 28 (Spring 1984): 125-123.

---. "Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree Outside Delhi, May 1817." Critical Inquiry 12 (Autumn 1985): 144-165.

---. "Sly Civility." October 34 (1985): 71-80.

Blake, William. Selected Poems. Ed. P. H. Butter. London: Dent, 1982.

Boas, George. The Cult of Childhood. London: Warburg Institute, 1966.

Brantlinger, Patrick. Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830-1914. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988.

Bristow, Joseph. Empire Boys: Adventures in a Man's World. London: HarperCollins, 1991.

Buchanan, Robert. "The Voice of 'the Hooligan'." The Contemporary Review LXXVI (December 1899): 774-89.

Buchanan, Robert Williams and Sir Walter Besant. The Voice of "The Hooligan": A Discussion of Kiplingism. New York: Tucker, 1900.

Burroughs, Edgar Rice. Tarzan of the Apes. New York: Ballantine, 1983.

Chaudhuri, Napur and Margaret Strobel. "Introduction." Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance. Eds. Chaudhuri and Strobel. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1992.

Chaudhuri, S. B. Theories of the Indian Mutiny (1857-59). Calcutta: World Press, 1965.

Clifford, James. "On Ethnographic Allegory." Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Eds. James Clifford and George E. Marcus. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986.

---. "Introduction: Partial Truths." Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Eds. James Clifford and George E. Marcus. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986.

---. The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard UP, 1988.

Conrad, Joseph. Heart of Darkness. London: Penguin, 1973.

David, Deirdre. "Children of Empire: Victorian Imperialism and Sexual Politics in Dickens and Kipling." Gender and Discourse in Victorian Literature and Art. Eds. Anthony Harrison and Beverly Taylor. DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 1992.

DeMause, Lloyd. "The Evolution of Childhood." The History of Childhood. New York: Psychohistory Press, 1974.

Dickens, Charles. Oliver Twist. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.

Dunae, Patrick. "New Grub Street for Boys." Imperialism and Juvenile Literature. Ed. Jeffrey Richards. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1989.

---. "Penny Dreadfuls: Late Nineteenth-Century Boys' Literature and Crime." Victorian Studies 22 (1979).

Elias, Norbert. The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners. Vol. 1 of 2. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. New York: Urizen, 1978.

---. The Civilizing Process: State Formation and Civilization. Vol. 2 of 2. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1982.

Fabian, Johannes. Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object. New York: Columbia UP, 1983.

Farrar, F. W. Eric: Or, Little by Little. New York, Garland, 1977.

Foucault, Michel. The Archeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language. Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon, 1972.

---. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1979.

---. The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1990.

---. The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences. World of Man Series (Ed. R. D. Laing). New York, Vintage, 1973.

Freud, Sigmund. "The Uncanny." New Literary History 7 (Spring 1976): 619-45.

Gilmour, Robin. "Stalky & Co.: Revising the Code." Kipling Considered. Ed. Phillip Mallett. London: MacMillan, 1989.

Gournay, Jean-François. "Ésquisse d'une lecture anthropologique de Kim." Études Anglaises: Grand Bretagne, États Unis, 35.4 (1982): 385-395.

Green, Martin. Dreams of Adventure, Deeds of Empire. New York: Basic Books, 1979.

Guha, Ranajit. Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India. Delhi: Oxford UP, 1983.

---. "The Prose of Counter-Insurgency." Selected Subaltern Studies. Eds. Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. New York: Oxford UP, 1988.

Henty, G. A. The Young Colonists: A Story of the Zulu and Boer Wars. Glasgow: Blackie, 1898.

Hobsbawm, E. J. The Age of Empire, 1875-1914. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987.

Holland, Clive (Charles James Hankinson). "Rudyard Kipling and his Critics." Literature (London) VI (February 1900): 153-54.

Hutchins, Francis. The Illusion of Permanence: British Imperialism in India. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1967.

Hughes, Thomas. Tom Brown's Schooldays. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.

Inden, Ronald. Imagining India. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.

Islam, Shamsul. Kipling's "Law": A study of his philosophy of life. London: MacMillan, 1975.

Kinkead-Weekes, Mark. "Vision in Kipling's Novels." Kipling's Mind and Art. Ed. Andrew Rutherford. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1964.

Kipling, Rudyard. The Day's Work. Ed. Thomas Pinney. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.

---. Departmental Ditties; Barrack-Room Ballads, and Other Verses. The Five Nations. The Seven Seas. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Page, 1927.

---. The Jungle Books. Ed. W. W. Robson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992.

---. Kim. Ed. Alan Sandison. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.

---. Life's Handicap. Ed. A. O. J. Cockshut. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.

---. Plain Tales from the Hills. Ed. Andrew Rutherford. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.

---. Puck of Pook's Hill and Rewards and Fairies. Ed. Donald Mackenzie. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993.

---. Something of Myself and Other Autobiographical Writings. Ed. Thomas Pinney. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

---. Stalky & Co. Ed. Isabel Quigley. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.

Krupat, Arnold. Ethnocriticism: Ethnography, History, Literature. Berkeley: U of California P, 1992.

Lacan, Jacques. Écrits: A Selection. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: W. W. Norton, 1977.

Locke, John. Some Thoughts Concerning Education. London: Cambridge UP, 1934.

McBratney, John. "Imperial Subjects, Imperial Space in Kipling's Jungle Book." Victorian Studies 35.3 (Spring 1992): 277-293.

McClure, John A. Kipling and Conrad: The Colonial Fiction. Cambridge (MA): Harvard UP, 1981.

Macherey, Pierre. The Theory of Literary Production. Trans. Geoffrey Wall. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.

Mackenzie, Donald. "Introduction." Puck of Pook's Hill and Rewards and Fairies. Ed. Donald Mackenzie. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993.

MacKenzie, John M. Propaganda and Empire: The Manipulation of British Public Opinion, 1880-1960. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1984.

Marcus, George E. "Contemporary Problems of Ethnography in the Modern World System." Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Eds. James Clifford and George E. Marcus. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986.

Marryat, Captain. Masterman Ready. New York: Garland, 1976.

Mohanty, Satya P. "Drawing the Color Line: Kipling and the Culture of Colonial Rule." The Bounds of Race: Perspectives on Hegemony and Resistance. Ed. Dominick LaCapra. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991.

---. "Kipling's children and the colour line." Race & Class 31.1 (1989): 21-39.

Montaigne, Michel de. Essays and Selected Writings. (Bilingual Edition.) Trans. Donald M. Frame. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963.

Morris, James. Farewell the Trumpets: An Imperial Retreat. London: Penguin, 1979.

---. Heaven's Command: An Imperial Progress. London: Penguin, 1979.

---. Pax Britannica: The Climax of an Empire. London: Penguin, 1979.

Mukherjee, Sujit. "Tigers in Fiction: An Aspect of the Colonial Encounter." Kunapipi 9.1 (1987): 1-13.

Murray, John. "The Law of The Jungle Books." Children's Literature 20. Eds. F. Butler, B. Rosen, and J. Plotz. Roanoke (VA): Yale UP, 1992.

Ondaatje, Michael. The English Patient. Toronto: Vintage, 1993.

The Oxford English Dictionary. (20 vols.) 2nd Edition. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.

Parry, Benita. "The Contents and Discontents of Kipling's Imperialism." New Formations 6 (1988): 49-63.

---. Delusions and Discoveries: Studies on India in the British Imagination 1880-1930. Allen Lane, 1972.

Plotz, Judith A. "The Empire of Youth: Crossing and Double-Crossing Cultural Barriers in Kipling's Kim." Children's Literature 20. Eds. F. Butler, B. Rosen, and J. Plotz. Roanoke (VA): Yale UP, 1992.

Poovey, Mary. Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988.

Pratt, Mary Louise. Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation. London: Routledge, 1992.

Quigly, Isabel. The Heirs of Tom Brown: The English School Story. London: Chatto and Windus, 1982.

---. "Introduction." Stalky & Co. Ed. Isabel Quigley. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.

Richards, Jeffrey. "Introduction." Imperialism and Juvenile Literature. Ed. Jeffrey Richards. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1989.

Rosaldo, Renato. "From the Door of His Tent: The Fieldworker and the Inquisitor." Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Eds. James Clifford and George E. Marcus. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986.

Rose, Jacqueline. The Case of Peter Pan or The Impossibility of Children's Fiction. London: Macmillan, 1984.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. Émile. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1911.

Said, Edward W. Culture and Imperialism. New York: Knopf, 1993.

---. Orientalism. New York: Vintage, 1979.

Scott, Carole. "Kipling's Combat Zones: Training Grounds in the Mowgli stories, Captains Courageous, and Stalky & Co." Children's Literature 20. Eds. F. Butler, B. Rosen, and J. Plotz. Roanoke (VA): Yale UP, 1992.

Sharpe, Jenny. Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1993.

---. "The Unspeakable Limits of Rape: Colonial Violence and Counter-Insurgency." Genders 10 (Spring 1991): 25-46.

Slemon, Stephen. "Monuments of Empire: Allegory/ Counter-Discourse/ Post-Colonial Writing." Kunapipi 9.3 (1987): 1-16.

Sommerville, C. John. The Rise and Fall of Childhood. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1982.

Spear, Percival. A History of India. (Volume Two.) Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1965.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture. Eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1988.

---. "Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography." Selected Subaltern Studies. Eds. Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. New York: Oxford UP, 1988.

Stokes, Eric. The English Utilitarians and India. Oxford: Clarendon, 1959.

---. The Peasant Armed: The Indian Revolt of 1857. Ed. C. A. Bayly. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986.

Suleri, Sara. The Rhetoric of British India. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.

Turner, Victor. Dramas, Fields, Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1974.

Tyler, Stephen A. "Post-Modern Ethnography: From the Document of the Occult to the Occult Document." Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Eds. James Clifford and George E. Marcus. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986.

Viswanathan, Gauri. Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India. New York: Columbia UP, 1989.

Watson, Ian. "Victorian England, Colonialism and the Ideology of Tom Brown's Schooldays." Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik 29.2 (1981): 116-129.

Wegner, Phillip E. "'Life as He Would Have It': The Invention of India in Kipling's Kim." Cultural Critique (Winter 1993-94): 129-159.

Wright, Terence. "Two Little Worlds of School: an Outline of a Dual Tradition in Schoolboy Fiction." Durham University Journal 75 (December 1982): 59-71.

Wurgaft, Lewis D. The Imperial Imagination: Magic and Myth in Kipling's India. Middletown (Connecticut): Wesleyan UP, 1983.

Zipes, Jack. Fairy Tales and the Art of Subversion: The Classical Genre for Children and the Process of Civilization. New York: Wildman, 1983.

Zizek, Slavoj. The Sublime Object of Ideology. London: Verso, 1989.